

JOURNAL
OF THE
AMERICAN
ORIENTAL
SOCIETY

EDITOR

W. NORMAN BROWN
University of Pennsylvania

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

JOHN K. SHRYOCK
Philadelphia, Pa.

E. A. SPEISER
University of Pennsylvania

RAMA VARMA RESEARCH INSTITUTE.
TRICHUR, COCHIN STATE.
JOURNAL

1136

APR 1938

OF THE

AMERICAN ORIENTAL SOCIETY

EDITOR

W. NORMAN BROWN
University of Pennsylvania

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

JOHN K. SHRYOCK
Philadelphia, Pa.

E. A. SPEISER
University of Pennsylvania



VOLUME 56

nos 1-4



PUBLISHED BY THE AMERICAN ORIENTAL SOCIETY

ADDRESS, CARE OF

YALE UNIVERSITY PRESS

NEW HAVEN, CONNECTICUT, U. S. A.

1936

A copy of this volume, postage paid, may be obtained anywhere within the limits of the Universal Postal Union, by sending a Postal Money Order for six dollars, or its equivalent, to The YALE UNIVERSITY PRESS, New Haven, Connecticut, United States of America.



PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
BY J. H. FURST COMPANY, BALTIMORE, MARYLAND

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
ALBRIGHT, W. F.: How well can we know the Ancient Near East? . .	121
ALLEN, T. G.: Types of Rubrics in the Egyptian Book of the Dead . .	145
BACHHOFFER, L.: Herrscher und Münzen der späten Kushānas	429
BARTON, G. A.: The Origin of the Thought-Pattern which survives in Baptism	155
BLOCH, J.: Richard James Horatio Gottheil, 1862-1936	472
BOBRINSKOY, G. V.: A Line of Brāhmī (?) Script in a Babylonian Contract Tablet (with 1 illustration)	86
BULL, L.: Four Egyptian inscribed Statuettes of the Middle King- dom (with five plates)	186
——— OLMSTEAD, A. T., SPEISER, E. A.: James Henry Breasted, 1865- 1935 (with frontispiece)	113
BURROWS, M.: I Have Written on the Door	491
COHEN: Review of Goodenough's <i>By Light Light, The Mystic Gospel of Hellenistic Judaism</i>	500
COMFORT, H.: Review of Bonner's <i>A Papyrus Codex of the Shepherd of Hermas (Similitudes 2-9) with A Fragment of the Mandates</i>	103
CREEL, H. G.: Bronze Inscriptions of the Western Chou Dynasty as Historical Documents	335
——— Review of Chalfant's <i>The Couling-Chalfant Collection of In- scribed Oracle Bones</i> , ed. Britton	528
DUNHAM, D.: Note on some Old Squeezes from Egyptian Monuments (with two illustrations in text and two plates)	173
DYEN, I.: A Dubious Old Persian Tablet in Philadelphia	91
EDGERTON, F.: Review of Sukthankar's <i>The Mahābhārata, Adiparvan: Fascicule 7</i>	360
——— Review of Renou's <i>Études de grammaire sanskrite. Première série</i>	362
——— Review of Wüst's <i>Vergleichendes und etymologisches Wörter- buch des alt-Indoarischen [Altindischen]</i> , Lief. 1-3	364
——— Review of Tilak's <i>Śrīmad Bhagavadgītā Rahasya or Karma- Yoga-Sūtra</i> , Irad. Sukthankar	525
EDGERTON, W. F.: Two Notes on the Flying Gallop (with five plates) .	178
FARIS, N. A.: Review of Mamour's <i>Polemics on the Fatimi Caliphs</i> .	509
——— Review of Feghali's <i>Contes, Legendes, Coutumes Populaires du Liban et de Syrie</i>	509
FISH, T.: A Nippur Tablet of Ur III	494
GARDINER, A. H.: The Egyptian Origin of some English Personal Names	189
GATES, J.: Model Emperors of the Golden Age in Chinese Lore	51
GEHMAN, H. S.: Review of Schmidt's <i>Kephalaia, Band I, Manichäische Handschriften der staatlichen Museen Berlin</i>	520
GLIDDEN, H. W.: A Note on Early Arabian Military Organization . .	88
GLUECK, N.: The Theophany of the God of Sinai	402

	PAGE
GOETZE, A.: The <i>t</i> -form of the Old Babylonian Verb	297
HITTI, P. K.: Review of Wensinck's <i>Concordance et indices de la tradition musulmane</i>	510
—— Review of Grousset's <i>Histoire des croisades et du royaume franc de Jérusalem: Vol. I. L'anarchie musulmane et la monarchie franque</i> [1097-1131]	510
—— Review of Munro's <i>The Kingdom of the Crusades</i>	510
—— Review of Halkin's <i>Moslem Schisms and Sects</i> [<i>al-Fark bain al-Firak</i>]	510
—— Review of Ivanow's <i>Diwan of Khaki Khorasani: Two Early Ismaili Treatises, i. e., Haft Babi Bab Sayyid-na and Matlubul-Mu'minin</i> , by Nasir'd-din Tusi and <i>True Meaning of Religion, i. e., Risala dar Haqqiqati Din</i> by Shihabud'din Shah	510
—— Review of 'Abbas Mahmud's <i>al-Islam w-al-Tajadd fi Misr</i>	510
—— Review of Sa'id B. Himadeh's <i>Monetary and Banking System of Syria</i>	510
—— Review of Zurayk's <i>The Yazidis, Past and Present</i> , by Isma'il Beg Ohol	510
—— Review of Anis Khuri al-Maqdisi's <i>Tatawur al-Asalib al-Nathriyah fi al-Adab al-'Arabi: Vol. I</i>	510
—— Review of Jibrail S. Jabbur's <i>'Umar ibn-abi-Rabi'ah, Vol. I.: 'Asr ibn-abi Rabi'ah</i>	510
—— Review of Al-amir Haydar al-Shihabi's <i>Lubnan fi 'Ahd al-Umara al-Shihabiyyin</i>	510
JACKSON, A. V. W.: Traces of Biblical Influence in the Turfan Pahlavi Fragment M. 173	198
JOHNSON, H. M.: The Lemon in India	47
—— Correction—The Lemon in India	384
—— Review of Winternitz's <i>A History of Indian Literature. Vol. II: Buddhist Literature and Jain Literature</i>	371
—— Review of Faddegon's <i>The Pravacanasara of Kundakunda acarya, together with the Commentary Tattva-dipika by Amrtacandra Suri</i>	523
—— Review of Upadhye's <i>Sri Kundakundacarya's Pravacanasara</i>	523
JOHNSON, J.: Review of McDowell's <i>Coins from Seleucia on the Tigris</i>	517
—— Review of McDowell's <i>Stamped and Inscribed Objects from Seleucia on the Tigris</i>	517
JURJI, E. J.: Review of Spies and Khatak's <i>Three Treatises on Mysticism by Shihabuddin Suhrawardi Maqtul</i>	516
KENT, R. G.: The Present Status of Old Persian Studies	208
MARCUS, R.: Review of Frey's <i>Corpus Inscriptionum Judaicarum: Vol. I. Europe</i>	505
MATTHEWS, C. D.: A Muslim Iconoclast (Ibn Taymiyyeh) on the "Merits" of Jerusalem and Palestine	1
MONTGOMERY, J. A.: Ras Shamra Notes V	226
—— Ras Shamra Notes VI: The Danel Text	440
—— Review of <i>Orientalische Studien Erno Littmann zu seinem 60 Geburtstag</i>	104

	PAGE
MONTGOMERY, J. A.: Review of Mingana's <i>Woodbroke Studies: Christian Documents in Syriac, Arabic, and Garshuni</i>	499
NELSON, H. H.: Three Decrees of Ramses III from Karnak (with three plates)	232
NYKŁ, A. K.: Notes on E. H. Palmer's "The Qur'ān"	77
OBERMANN, J.: Review of Montgomery and Harris' <i>The Ras Shamra Mythological Texts</i>	495
OLMSTEAD, A. T.: Intertestamental Studies	242
——, BULL, L., SPEISER, E. A.: James Henry Breasted, 1865-1935 (with frontispiece)	113
PEAKE, C. H.: Review of Latourette's <i>The Chinese: Their History and Culture</i>	533
PRATT, I. A.: Selected Bibliography of R. J. H. Gottheil	480
PRINCE, J. D.: Turkic Material in Hungarian	446
REICH, N. J.: The Elkan Adler Papyrus No. 31 (with one plate) . .	258
SAKANISHI, S.: Review of Koizumi and Sawa's <i>Rakuro Saikyu-bo</i> . .	101
—— Review of Ku Teng's <i>Chinesische Malkunsttheorie in der T'ang und Sungzeit: Versuch einer geschichtlichen Betrachtung</i> . . .	530
—— Review of Sirén's <i>The Chinese on the Art of Painting: Translations and Comments</i>	531
SAPIT, E.: <i>ḱiḱḱa</i> , a Karian Gloss	85
—— Hebrew 'argāz, a Philistine Word (with one figure)	272
SHRYOCK, J. K.: Review of Zach's <i>Übersetzungen aus dem Wên Hsüan</i> . .	94
—— Review of Clark's <i>The Prose-Poetry of Su Tung-p'o</i>	95
—— Review of Médard's <i>Le Choei-king Tchou et l'ancienne géographie Indochinoise</i>	96
—— Review of Margouliès' <i>Petit Précis de Grammaire Chinoise écrite</i>	97
—— Review of Graham's <i>A Preliminary Report of the Hanchow Excavation</i>	98
—— Review of Williamson's <i>Wang an Shih, A Chinese Statesman and Educationalist of the Sung Dynasty, Vol. I.</i>	99
—— Review of Ashton's <i>Chinese Art</i>	373
—— Review of Ecke and Demiéville's <i>The Twin Pagodas of Zayton</i> .	373
—— Review of Jabłoński's <i>Les "Siao-ha (i-eu) l-yu" de Pékin; un essai sur la poésie populaire en Chine</i>	375
—— Review of Bounakoff's <i>The Oracle Bones from Honan</i>	376
—— Review of Kurakichi Shiratori's <i>Memoirs of the Research Department of the Toyo Bunko, No. 4</i>	377
—— Review of Biallas' <i>Monumenta Serica; Journal of Oriental Studies of the Catholic University of Peking</i>	379
—— Review of Dupont's <i>Catalogue des Collections Indo-Chinoises</i> .	380
—— Review of Katashi Kakinuma's <i>Catalogue of the Library of the South Manchurian Railway</i>	381
—— Review of Elisséeff, Gardner, and Ware's <i>Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies, Vol. 1, No. 1</i>	381
—— Review of March's <i>Some Technical Terms of Chinese Painting</i> .	382
SKOSS, S. L.: Review of Obermann's <i>Studies in Islam and Judaism: The Arabic Original of Ibn Shāhin's Book of Comfort, Known as the Hibbār Yaphē of R. Nissīm b. Ya'aqobh</i>	506

	PAGE
SPEISER, E. A.: Studies in Semitic Formatives	22
—— Review of Driver and Miles' <i>The Assyrian Laws</i>	107
—— Review of Malloy and Rose's <i>Prehistoric Assyria: The Excavations at Tall Arpachiyah, 1933</i>	109
—— OLMSTEAD, A. T., BULL, L.: James Henry Breasted, 1865-1935 (with frontispiece)	113
STURTEVANT, E. H.: Two Hittite Words	282
TOMITA, K.: Review of Warner's <i>The Craft of the Japanese Sculptor</i>	536
TORREY, C. C.: An Arabic Papyrus Dated 205 A. H. (with one plate)	288
—— Note on the Line of Brahmi (?) Script on a Babylonian Tablet	490
TUTTLE, E. H.: Review of Bray's <i>The Brāhūi Language. Part II: The Brāhūi Problem; Part III: Etymological Vocabulary</i>	350
VERNADSKY, G.: Notes on the History of the Uigurs in the Late Middle Ages	453
WATERMAN, L.: Review of Cameron's <i>History of Early Iran</i>	519
WILSON, J. A.: Illuminating the Thrones at the Egyptian Jubilee	293

BRIEF COMMUNICATIONS:

Sapir, E.	85
Bobrinskoy, G. V.	86
Glidden, H. W.	88
Dyen, I.	91
Torrey, C. C.	490
Burrows, M.	491
Fish, T.	494
CORRECTION: The Lemon in India (Johnson)	384
NOTES OF THE SOCIETY:	111, 384, 537
NOTES OF OTHER SOCIETIES:	112, 385, 537
PROCEEDINGS OF THE SOCIETY AT NEW HAVEN	386
PROCEEDINGS OF THE MIDDLE WEST BRANCH OF THE SOCIETY AT CHICAGO	418
CONSTITUTION AND BY-LAWS OF THE SOCIETY	424
LIST OF MEMBERS:	538

LIST OF BOOKS REVIEWED

ASHTON, L.: Chinese Art (J. K. Shryock)	373
BIALLAS, F. X.: Monumenta Serica; Journal of Oriental Studies of the Catholic University of Peking (J. K. Shryock)	379
BOUNAKOFF, G.: The Oracle Bones from Honan (J. K. Shryock)	376
BONNER, C.: A Papyrus Codex of the Shepherd of Hermas (Similitudes 2-9) with a Fragment of the Mandates (H. Comfort)	103
BRAY, SIR D.: The Brāhūi Language. Part II: The Brāhūi Problem; Part III: Etymological Vocabulary (E. H. Tuttle)	350
CAMERON, G. G.: History of Early Iran (L. Waterman)	519
CHALFANT, F. H.: The Couling-Chalfant Collection of Inscribed Oracle Bones, ed. Britton (H. G. Creel)	528

	PAGE
CLARK, C. D. LEG.: The Prose-Poetry of Su Tung-p'o (J. K. Shryock)	95
DEMIÉVILLE, P., and ECKE, G.: The Twin Pagodas of Zayton (J. K. Shryock)	373
DRIVER, G. R., and MILES, J. C.: The Assyrian Laws (E. A. Speiser)	107
DUFONT, P.: Catalogues des Collections Indochinoises (J. K. Shryock)	380
ECKE, G., and DEMIÉVILLE, P.: The Twin Pagodas of Zayton (J. K. Shryock)	373
ELISSÉEFF, S., GARDNER, C. S., and WARE, J. R.: Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies. Vol. 1, No. 1 (J. K. Shryock)	381
FADDEGON, B.: The Pravacanasāra of Kunda-kunda ācārya, together with the commentary Tattvadipikā by Amṛtacandra Sūri (H. M. Johnson)	523
FEHALL, M.: Contes, Légendes, Coutumes Populaires du Liban et de Syrie (N. A. Faris)	509
FREY, P. J-B.: Corpus Inscriptionum Judaicarum: Vol. I. Europe (R. Marcus)	505
GARDNER, C. S., ELISSÉEFF, S., and WARE, J. R.: Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies. Vol. 1, No. 1 (J. K. Shryock)	381
GOODENOUGH, E. R.: By Light Light, The Mystic Gospel of Hellenistic Judaism (B. Cohen)	500
GRAHAM, D. C.: A Preliminary Report of the Hanchow Excavation (J. K. Shryock)	98
GROUSSET, R.: Histoire des croisades et du royaume franc de Jérusalem: Vol. I. L'anarchie musulmane et la monarchie franque [1097-1131] (P. K. Hitti)	510
HALKIN, A. S. (trad.): Moslem Schisms and Sects [al-Farḡ bain al-Firaḡ] (P. K. Hitti)	510
HARRIS, Z. S. and MONTGOMERY, J. A.: The Ras Shamra Mythological Texts (J. Obermann)	495
HARVARD JOURNAL OF ASIATIC STUDIES, Vol. I, No. 1 (J. K. Shryock)	381
ḤIMADEH, SĀ'īd B.: Monetary and Banking System of Syria (P. K. Hitti)	510
IVANOW, W.: Diwan of Khaki Khorasani: Two Early Ismaili Treatises, i. e., Haft Babi Bab Sayyid-na and Matlubu'l-Mu'minin, by Nasiru'd-din Tusi and True Meaning of Religion, i. e., Risala dar Haqqiqati Din by Shihabu'din Shah (P. K. Hitti)	510
JABBŪR, JIRRĀ'īl S.: 'Umar ibn-abi-Rabi'ah, Vol. I: 'Aṣr ibn-abi Rabi'ah (P. K. Hitti)	510
JABŁÓŃSKI, W.: Les "Siao-ha (i-eu)-lyu" de Pékin; un essai sur la poésie populaire en chine (J. K. Shryock)	375
KAKINUMA, K.: Catalogue of the Library of the South-Manchurian Railway (J. K. Shryock)	381
KHATAK, S. K., and SPIES, O.: Three Treaties on Mysticism by Shih-abuddin Suhrawardi Maqtūl (E. J. Jurji)	518
KOIZUMI, A. and SAWA, S.: Rakuro Saikyū-bo (S. Sakanishi)	101
KU TENG: Chinesische Malkunsttheorie in der T'angund Sungzeit: Versuch einer geschichtlichen Betrachtung (S. Sakanishi)	530
LATOURETTE, K. S.: The Chinese: Their History and Culture (C. H. Peake)	533

	PAGE
MAHMŪD, 'ABBAS: <i>Al-Islam w-al-Tajdīd fī Miṣr</i> (P. K. Hitti) . . .	510
MALLOWAN, M. E. L., and ROSE, J. C.: <i>Prehistoric Assyria: The Excavations at Tall Arpachiyah, 1933</i> (E. A. Speiser)	109
MAMOUR, P. H.: <i>Polemics on the Fatimi Caliphs</i> (N. A. Faris) . . .	509
AL-MAQDISI, ANĪS KHŪRĪ: <i>Taṭawŭr al-Asālib al-Nathriyah fī al-Ādab al-'Arabi</i> Vol. I (P. K. Hitti)	510
MARCH, B.: <i>Some Technical Terms of Chinese Painting</i> (J. K. Shryock)	382
MARGOULLES, G.: <i>Petit Précis de Grammaire Chinoise écrite</i> (J. K. Shryock)	97
McDOWELL, R. H.: <i>Stamped and Inscribed Objects from Seleucia on the Tigris</i> (J. Johnson)	517
——— <i>Coins from Seleucia on the Tigris</i> (J. Johnson)	517
MÉDARD, M.: <i>Le Choei-king Tchou et l'ancienne géographie Indochinoise</i> (J. K. Shryock)	96
MILES, J. C., and DRIVER, G. R.: <i>The Assyrian Laws</i> (E. A. Speiser)	107
MINGANA, A.: <i>Woodbroke Studies: Christian Documents in Syriac, Arabic, and Garshuni</i> (J. A. Montgomery)	499
MONTGOMERY, J. A., and HARRIS, T. S.: <i>The Ras Shamra Mythological Texts</i> (J. Obermann)	495
MONUMENTA SERICA: <i>Journal of Oriental Studies of the Catholic University of Peking</i> (J. K. Shryock)	379
MUNRO, D. C.: <i>The Kingdom of the Crusades</i> (P. K. Hitti)	510
OBERMANN, J.: <i>Studies in Islam and Judaism: The Arabic Original of Ibn Shāhin's Book of Comfort, Known as the Hibbūr Yaphē of R. Nissim b. Ya'aqobh</i> (S. L. Skoss)	506
ORIENTALISCHE STUDIEN ENNO LITTMANN ZU SEINEM 60. GEBURTSTAG . . . ÜBERREICHT . . . (J. A. Montgomery)	104
RENOU, L.: <i>études de grammaire sanskrite. Première série</i> (F. Edgerton)	362
ROSE, J. C., and MALLOWAN, M. E. L.: <i>Prehistoric Assyria: The Excavations at Tall Arpachiyah, 1933</i> (E. A. Speiser)	109
SAWA, S., and KOIZUMI, A.: <i>Rakuro Saikyu-bo</i> (S. Sakanishi)	101
SCHMIDT, C.: <i>Kephalaia, Band I, Manichäische Handschriften der staatlichen Museen Berlin</i> (H. S. Gehman)	520
AL-SHIHĀBĪ, AL-AMĪR ḤAYDAR: <i>Lubnān fī 'Ahd al-Umarā al-Shihābiyyīn</i> (P. K. Hitti)	510
SHIRATORI, K.: <i>Memoirs of the Research Department of the Toyo Bunko, No. 4</i> (J. K. Shryock)	377
SIRĒN, O.: <i>The Chinese on the Art of Painting: Translations and Comments</i> (S. Sakanishi)	531
SPIES, O., and KHATAK, S. K.: <i>Three Treatises on Mysticism by Shih-abuddin Suhrawerdī Maqtūl</i> (E. J. Jurji)	516
SUKTHANKAR, V. S.: <i>The Mahābhārata, Ādiparvan: Fascicule 7</i> (F. Edgerton)	360
TILAK, B. G.: <i>Śrīmad Bhagavadgītā Rahasya or Karma-Yoga-Sāstra, trad. Sukthankar</i> (F. Edgerton)	525
TOYO BUNKO, <i>MEMOIRS OF THE RESEARCH DEPARTMENT OF THE, No. 4</i> (J. K. Shryock)	377

	PAGE
UPADHYE, A. N.: Śrī Kundakundācārya's Pravacanasāra (H. M. Johnson)	523
WARE, J. R., ELISSÉEFF, S., and GARDNER, C. S.: Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies. Vol. 1, No. 1 (J. K. Shryock)	381
WARNER, L.: The Craft of the Japanese Sculptor (K. Tomita)	536
WENSINCK, A. J.: Concordance et indices de la tradition musulmane (P. K. Hitti)	510
WILLIAMSON, H. R.: Wang An Shih, A Chinese Statesman and Educationalist of the Sung Dynasty, Vol. I (J. K. Shryock)	99
WINTERNITZ, M.: A History of Indian Literature. Vol. II: Buddhist Literature and Jain Literature (H. M. Johnson)	371
WÜST, W. VON.: Vergleichendes und etymologisches Wörterbuch des Alt-Indoarischen [Altindischen], Lief. 1-3 (F. Edgerton)	364
ZACH, E. VON.: Übersetzungen aus dem Wên Hsüan (J. K. Shryock) .	94
ZUBAYK, C. K.: The Yazīdis, Past and Present, by Ismā'īl Beg Chol (P. K. Hitti)	510



A MUSLIM ICONOCLAST (IBN TAYMĪYYEH) ON THE "MERITS" OF JERUSALEM AND PALESTINE

CHARLES D. MATTHEWS
BIRMINGHAM-SOUTHERN COLLEGE

ISLAMIC popular legends surrounding holy places in Jerusalem and Palestine are very numerous. Works of history, geography, and religion by Muslim authors of the past have been liberally supplied with them. Their prominence is due to the fact that Jerusalem and all Palestine have been and are just as holy in the eyes of the Faithful as to Jews and Christians. Jerusalem is the first of the two *qiblas*, and the third (after Mecca and Medina) of the most sacred lands—*awwal al-qiblatain wathālith al-haramain ash-sharīfain*.

The "Cult of the Holy Land" within Islam grew up naturally, from the Jewish-Christian foundation of the new religion. (Many of the actual legends are Jewish or Christian in origin.) It was developed by the religious and political policies of the Omayyad Caliph 'Abd al-Malik in face of his rival 'Abdullah ibn az-Zubeir in Mecca and the Hejaz. It was heightened by the crisis of the Crusades and the temporary loss of the territory of Palestine and the Syrian littoral covered by the Crusader states. The exalted and universal veneration for Palestine is attested by a number of works on the "merits" (*faḍā'il*) of the Holy City and the Holy Land.¹ Extravagant traditions are repeated in many books as to the value of prayer, fasting, alms, a lesser pilgrimage, and other religious exercises—even to making regular Pilgrimage, or Ḥajj, to Jerusalem as to Mecca.

It is rare to find, outside the great circle of learning and reason of the Mu'tazilites in the reign of Ma'mūn and following (ninth century, Christian era), individuals opposed to the exaggerated

¹ See the list of works on Syria and Palestine in LeStrange, *Palestine Under the Moslems*, London and Boston, 1890; Reynolds, *The History of the Temple of Jerusalem*, London, 1836 (really a translation, poorly done, of the *Ithāf ul-Akhiṣṣā*, by Shams or Kamāl ud-Dīn as-Suyūṭī); and the catalogues of collections of Arabic MSS. On the question of the Jewish-Christian origins of Islam, see Torrey, *The Jewish Foundation of Islam*, Jewish Institute of Religion Press, New York, 1933 (Hilda Stich Stroock Lectures).

popular views of the sanctity of Jerusalem and Palestine, and definitely engaged in a campaign of iconoclasm. Such a one was Aḥmad ibn Taymīyyeh al-Ḥarrānī, whose very brief work, *Qā'ida fī Ziyāra Beit al-Muqaddas* (or *al-Maqdis*), we are here considering. He and his work may claim our attention for a moment because of the universal interest of the subject, because of the unusual point of view and because of his importance as the main spiritual progenitor of the epoch-making Wahhābism of present-day Arabia.

The MS., only a few pages, is the second part of No. 295 of the Yale Landberg Collection of Arabic MSS. acquired by gift of Morris K. Jessup.² (The first part is another work by Ibn Taymīyyeh, *Kitāb al-Ba'alabakīyyeh*, on the characteristic contention that the word of Allah came directly to Mohammed and not through Gabriel or any intermediary.) The MS. naturally exhibits some of the defects inherent in copying. But it is for the most part clearly written. From the form of some of the letters and other evidence, I should judge it to be of fairly recent origin—say eighteenth century.

Illuminating details of the biography and work of Ibn Taymīyyeh are given by Nicholson, *Literary History of the Arabs*.³ He was born at Ḥarrān in 1263, was educated thoroughly in theology and canon law at Damascus, became a literalistic Ḥanbalite and fiery reformer seeking to "restore the primitive monotheism taught by the Prophet and to purge Islam of the heresies and corruptions which threatened to destroy it . . . saint-worship, pilgrimage to holy shrines, vows,* offerings, and invocations." He even protested against intercession through the Prophet and pilgrimage to his tomb in Medina. In several instances in the *Qā'ida* he says that unrepentant "heretics" must be killed. His thanks were opposition and imprisonment, in which condition he died. His reward was the mixed one of having more than 2,000,-

* Descriptive article by Prof. Charles C. Torrey, in *The Library Journal*, Feb., 1903. The Yale collection contains a third work of Ibn Taymīyyeh, No. 25 in the brief temporary catalogue in the hand of Count Landberg, *Kitāb al-Imān*, with a note by the collector that it has been used by Goldziher and Schreiner. The MSS. are at present being catalogued by Dr. Leon Nemoy of the Sterling Memorial Library at Yale, under supervision of Professor Torrey.

* Summary, pp. 462-3. Other references on pp. 371, 465, 466.

000 people present at his funeral—and to receive the very saint-adoration against which he had labored! His death occurred in Damascus, his adopted home, in 1328.⁴

The importance of Ibn Taymīyyeh for the modern East lies in the fact he was the direct spiritual ancestor of the Wahhābi Islam which made itself predominant in Arabia in the eighteenth century, was worsted by Muhammad 'Ali the maker of modern Egypt, remained a smoldering fire in the deserts of Nejd for nearly a century—and again has spread over almost the entire peninsula, ruling from the Holy Cities of Mecca and Medina no less than from the central desert capital of Riyadh. The story of the first triumph and temporary arrest of Wahhabism is well known.⁵ The second triumph has largely taken place since the World War. It has included the ousting of the Sharifian dynasty of King Hussein from the Hejaz by the victorious Ibn Sa'ūd. The latest phase was the successful martial strife with the Imam Yahya of the Yemen (a Shi'ah land) in the spring of 1934. The present ruler is concerned not only with matters of religious reform according to the stern, puritanical, iconoclastic example of the founder of the movement, Mohammed 'Abdul Wahhāb (born about 1720), but also with efforts to develop the natural resources of Arabia by application of modern science, and with a program of transforming his subjects, nomads from time immemorial, into settled dwellers in civic and agricultural life wherever practicable.⁶

What concerns us here is that all this transformation of Arabia that has been and will be⁷ is due to our author, Ibn Taymīyyeh. For the founder of Wahhabism was "fired by the example of Ibn Taymīyyeh, whose writings he copied with his own hand." Ibn

⁴ One year before the death of Ibn al-Firkāh of Damascus, whose work, *Kitāb Ba'ith an-Nufūs ilā Ziyārat al-Quds al-Mahrūs*, a good example of the collections of pious lore on Jerusalem and Palestine, was discussed in *The Journal of Biblical Literature*, LI, part II, 1932.

⁵ Summarized, Nicholson, p. 466. See also references to Burckhardt, "Materials for a History of the Wahabys," in his *Notes on the Bedouins and Wahabys*, London, 1831; Dozy, *Essai sur l'Histoire de L'Islamisme*, chap. 13; Philby, *Arabia*, etc.

⁶ See Philby, *Arabia*; Rihani, *Maker of Modern Arabia*, etc.

Philby says M. 'Abdul Wahhāb was born 1703; pp. 8, 54.

⁷ Indirectly, he has exerted important influence upon modern Islamic movements in such groups as that of the Sanussi, especially in North Africa. See, e. g., Nicholson, p. 468.

Taymīyyeh apparently was martyred in vain—"but his work was carried on by others and was crowned, after a long interval, by the Wahhabite Reformation."⁸

The zeal of the Wahhabis, in the eighteenth century and in the twentieth, has been directed against saint-worship, belief in intercession through any creature (even the Prophet), extravagance or display in tombs, buildings, or dress, and smoking. Needless to say, they maintain an opposition to alcoholic liquors, intensified beyond the usual Muslim interdiction. Their iconoclasm of earlier times was extreme. They interfered with the Pilgrimage, destroyed rich tombs of the saints and even that of the Prophet, and subjected the Black Stone to another smashing. These acts of religious violence are now not so common. But the same stern ideals of simplicity and purity of life and religion remain uncompromised.

Let us bring this introduction to a close with reference to the subjects which Ibn Taymīyyeh treats in the *Qā'ida*. Contrast with the ordinary popular view in such a work as the *Bā'ith an-Nufūs* of Ibn al-Firkāh would be most interesting.⁹

Pious journeys to Jerusalem, he says, despite traditions from the Prophet ranking it with Mecca and Medina, are only for prayer, invocation, *dhikr*, reading the Qur'ān, and private devotions. A vow for pious journey to Jerusalem may or may not be binding. A vow for such to the tomb of Abraham, the tomb of the Prophet, Mt. Sinai, Mt. Ḥirā' of Mohammed's meditations, the Cave of the Hijra, or other sacred places is not binding—and such pious visits are even forbidden. This view is emphasized by quotation of the following tradition:

"It is related of the Prophet (bless him!) in the two *Saḥiḥs* that in his death-illness he said, Allah confound the Jews and the Christians who take places associated with their prophets as places

⁸ Quotations from Nicholson. He refers in note 2, p. 466, to a valuable contribution by Goldziher to our knowledge of the literary relationships and religious influence of Ibn T. This is in ZDMG, Bd. 52, 1898, pp. 156-7, in a review of Patton's *Aḥmed ibn Ḥanbal and the Miḥna*, Leiden, 1897. The extant MSS. copied by hand of M. 'A. Wahhāb are in Leiden, "die Amīnschen Codices nr. 127 und 638" (Landberg, Cat. de mss. provenant d'une bibl. privée à el-Medina, 1883, 35, 137).

⁹ Now published in *JPOS.*, Jerusalem; introduction in last number 1934, text in autumn-winter number 1935.

of worship! What they do must be shunned! And 'Ā'isha said, Had it not been for this, his tomb would have become the chiefest shrine; but he disapproved its being made a place of worship."

Further: Traditions that Mohammed on the famous Night-Journey prayed elsewhere than in Jerusalem (as in Medina, at the Trees of Moses, Hebron, and Bethlehem) are false. Only ordinary acts of worship should be performed in Jerusalem, above all things, the circuit, or *ṭawāf*, must be reserved only for the Ka'aba in Mecca. Jerusalem as the first *qibla* is made light of, for although it was such, it has no authority now that the *qibla* is turned thither no more. The Dome of the Rock possesses and bestows no special merit. Omar, it is insisted, did not even pray there when in Jerusalem (though he did at the Mihrāb of David). In fact, the Rock had no roof over it through the Orthodox Caliphate and through the Omayyad era until the reign of 'Abd al-Malik, who thus and otherwise embellished the Ḥaram and Jerusalem and sought to establish regular Pilgrimage thither to deter his people from visiting Mecca and falling under influence of its master the rival caliph Ibn az-Zubeir. There is no footprint of Mohammed or Jesus on the Rock. The Valley of Jehoshaphat is not necessarily the place where the *Ṣirāṭ*, the slender Judgment path, will be set up. Worship in the Ḥaram area should be performed only at the Mosque al-Aqṣā.

Extravagant devotion toward and veneration of tombs of the prophets, etc., is decried (yet the author believes in the tradition that the "earth has no power to consume the flesh of the prophets"—and hence that they are preserved in a kind of death-sleep¹⁰ until the Judgment).

The question of the propriety of visiting places of worship of unbelievers is unsettled; but if they contain images or pictures, visiting them is prohibited. There are only three real *ḥarams* in the world—Mecca, Medina, and Wejj (a wady in Ṭā'if). There is danger in visiting such places as Jerusalem at the time of religious rites of the unbelievers. Pious visits to Asqalon, the Lebanons,

¹⁰ Cf. the accounts of visits to (and visions of visits to) tombs of the Patriarch-prophets underneath the Hebron Mosque, in the *Muthir al-Gharām li-Ziyārat al-Khalīl*, 'a. m., by Abu 'l-Fidā' of Hebron; which has been edited from MSS. in Yale, the British Museum, and the Bibliothèque Nationale, but not yet published.

etc., bestow no merit; for they are no longer the border-garrison posts where it formerly was meritorious to reside and to fight in the way of Allah.

Running into the subject of *jinn* who represent themselves as holy men in such regions as the Lebanons, the author suddenly turns from his topic to discuss at length how *jinn* have fooled people by appearing even in the form of the mysterious al-Khidr. He temporarily returns to his theme to argue against intercession through any creature—but again lets the *jinn* “fly away” with *him* as he tells how they transport folk on unhallowed pilgrimage and play other pranks on the too trustful.

It is reassuring for the future of the Islamic East that the spirit of Ibn Taymīyyeh in milder form has taken possession of many leaders of the people. One of the signs is this: Some guide books repeat the pious lore about the buildings of the Ḥaram in Jerusalem so as to lead the traveller to expect those in charge to reiterate the marvellous legends with the awe of thorough acceptance. But perhaps you also have had the experience of having these marvels indeed referred to underneath the Dome of the Rock—only for the insistence that they are not believed!

I am honored to have had the assistance of Professor Torrey on several of the notes in this study, and inadequately thank him here.

قاعدة في زيارة بيت المقدس

تصنيف الشيخ الامام العالم العلامة

احمد ابن تيمية (١)

رضي الله عنه وغفر له ولنا بكرمه

بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم الحمد لله نحمده ونستعينه
ونستعديه (٢) ونستغفره ونعوذ بالله (٣) من شرور انفسنا ومن
سيئات اعمالنا من يهد الله فلا مضل له من يضل فلا هادي له واشهد
ان لا اله الا الله وحده لا شريك له واشهد ان محمدا عبده ورسوله
صلى الله عليه وعلى آله وصحبه وسلم تسليما (٤) كثيرا

- فصل -

في زيارة بيت المقدس - ثبت في الصحيحين عن النبي (٥)
صلعم انه قال لا تشد الرحال الا الى ثلثة (٦) مساجد المسجد
الحرام والمسجد الاقصى ومسجدي هذا وفي الصحيحين من حديث
ابي سعيد وابي هريرة وقد روى من طرق اخرى وهو حديث
مستفيض متلقى بالقبول اجمع اهل العلم على صحته وتلقيه بالقبول
وتصديق واتفق عما المسلمون (٧) على استحباب السفر الى بيت
المقدس للعبادة المشروعة فيه كالصلاة (٨) والدعاء والذكر وقراءة
القرآن والاعتكاف

وقد روى من حديث رواه (٩) الحاكم في صحيحه ان سليمان
عم سأل ربه ثلاثا ملكا لا ينبغي لاحد من بعده وسأله حكما يوافق
حكمه وسأله انه لا يأتي (١٠) احد هذا البيت لا يريد الا الصلوة

فيه الا غفر له ولهذا كان ابن عمر رضى ياتي اليه فيصلي فيه ولا يشرب فيه ماء لتصيه دعوة سليمان لقوله لا يريد الا الصلوة فيه فان هذا يقتضي اخلاص النية في السفر اليه ولا يأتيه لغرض دنوي ولا بدعة

وتنازع العلماء فيمن نذر السفر اليه في الصلاة فيه او الاعتكاف فيه هل يجب عليه الوفاء بنذره على قولين مشهورين وهما قولان للشافعي احدهما يجب الوفاء بهذا النذر وهو قول الاكثرين مثل مالك واحمد بن حنبل وغيرهما والثاني لا يجب وهو قول ابي حنيفة فان من اصله انه لا يجب بالنذر الا ما كان من جنسه واجب بالشرع فلهذا يوجب نذر الصلاة والصيام والصدقة والحجّ والعمرة (١١) فان من جنسها واجب بالشرع واوجب نذر الاعتكاف فان الاعتكاف لا يصحّ عنده الا بصوم وهو مذهب مالك واحمد في احدى الروايتين عنه واما الاكثرين فيحتجون بما رواه البخاري في صحيحه عن عائشة رضى عن النبي صلعم انه قال من نذر ان يطيع الله فليطعه ومن نذر ان يعصى الله فلا يعصيه فامر النبي صلعم بالوفاء بالنذر لكل من نذر ان يطيع الله ولم يشترط ان تكون (١٢) الطاعة من جنس الواجب (١٣) بالشرع وهذا القول اصح وهكذا النزاع لو نذر السفر الى مسجد النبي صلعم مع انه افضل من المسجد الاقصى ولو (١٤) نذر اتيان (١٥) المسجد الحرام لحجّ او عمرة واجب (١٦) عليه الوفاء بنذره باتفاق العلماء

والمسجد الحرام افضل المساجد ويليه مسجد النبي صلعم ويليه المسجد الاقصى وقد ثبت في الصحيحين عن النبي صلعم انه قال صلوة في مسجدي هذا خير من الف صلاة فيما سواه من المساجد الا المسجد الحرام والذي عليه جمهور العلماء ان الصلاة في المسجد الحرام افضل منها في مسجد النبي صلعم وقد روى

احمد والنسائي وغيرهما عن النبي صلعم ان الصلاة في المسجد الحرام بمائة الف واما في المسجد الاقصى فقد روى انها بخمسين صلوة وقيل بخمسمائة صلوة وهو اشد

ولو نذر السفر الى قبر الخليل عم (١٧) او قبر النبي صلعم او الى الطور الذي كلم الله عليه موسى (١٨) عم او الى جبل حراء الذي كان النبي صلعم يتعبد فيه وجاءه الوحي فيه او الغار المذكور في القرآن او غير ذلك من المقابر والمقامات والمشاهد المضافة الى بعض الانبياء والمشائخ او الى بعض المغارات او الجبال لم يجب الوفاء بهذا النذر باتفاق الائمة الاربعة فان السفر الى هذه المواضع منهى عنه لنهي النبي صلعم لا تشد الرحال الا الى ثلثة مساجد

فاذا كانت المساجد التي هي من بيوت الله التي امر فيها بالصلوات الخمس قد نهى عن السفر اليها حتى مسجد قبا الذي يستحب لمن كان بالمدينة ان يذهب اليه لما ثبت في الصحيحين عن ابي عمر رضى عن النبي صلعم انه كان ياتي قبا كل سبت راكبا او (١٨) ماشا وروى الترمذي وغيره ان النبي صلعم قال من تطهر في بيته فاحسن الطهور ثم اتى مسجد قبا لا يريد الا الصلوة فيه كان له كعمرة قال الترمذي حديث حسن صحيح

فاذا كان مثل هذا ينهي عن السفر اليه وينهي عن السفر الى الطور المذكور في القرآن وكما قد ذكر مالك بالمواضع التي لم تبني للصلوات الخمس بل ينهي عن اتخاذها مساجد فقد ثبت في الصحيحين عن النبي صلعم انه قال في مرض موته لعن الله اليهود والنصارى اتخذوا اثار انبياءهم مساجد يحذر ما فعلوا قالت عائشة ولولا ذلك لابرز قبره ولكن كره ان يتخذ مسجدا وفي صحيح مسلم وغيره عنه صلعم انه قال انه من كان قبلكم كانوا يتخذون القبور مساجد الا فلا تتخذون القبور مساجد فاني انهاكم عن ذلك

ولهذا لم تكن الصحابة يسافرون الى شيء من مشاهد الانبياء لا مشهد ابراهيم الخليل عم ولا غيره

والنبي صلعم ليلة المعراج (٢٠) صلى في بيت المقدس ركعتين كما ثبت ذلك في الحديث الصحيح ولم يصل (٢١) في غيره واما ما يرويه بعض الناس من حديث المعراج انه صلى في المدينة وصلى عند قبر موسى (٢٢) عم وصلى عند قبر الخليل فكل هذه الاحاديث المذكوبة الموضوعة وقد رخص طائفة من المتأخرين في السفر الى المشاهد ولم ينقلوا ذلك عن احد من الائمة ولا احتجوا بحجة شرعية

- فصل -

والعبادات المشروعة في المسجد الاقصى هي من جنس العبادات المشروعة في مسجد النبي صلعم وسائر المساجد الا المسجد الحرام فانه يشرع فيه زيادة على سائر المساجد الطواف بالكعبة واستلام الركبتين اليمانيين وتقبيل الحجر الاسود واما مسجد النبي صلعم والمسجد الاقصى وسائر المساجد فليس فيها ما يطاف به ولا فيها ما يتمسح به ولا ما يقبل فلا يجوز لاحد ان يطوف بحجرة النبي صلعم ولا بغير ذلك من مقابر الانبياء والصالحين ولا بصخرة بيت المقدس ولا بغير هوءلاء (٢٣) لا بالقبة التي فوق جبل عرفات وامثالها

بل ليس في الارض مكانا يطاف به كما يطاف بالكعبة ومن اعتقد ان الطواف بغيرها مشروع فهو شرٌّ ممن يعتقد جواز الصلاة الى غير الكعبة فان النبي صلعم لما هاجر من مكة الى المدينة صلى بالمسلمين ثمانية عشر شهرا الى بيت المقدس فكانت قبله المسلمين هذه المدة ثم الله حول القبلة الى الكعبة وانزل الله في ذلك القرآن كما ذكر في سورة البقرة وصلى النبي صلعم

والمسلمون الى الكعبة وصارت هي القبلة وهي قبلة ابراهيم وغيره (٢٤) من الانبياء فمن اتخذ الصخرة اليوم قبلة يصلي اليها فهو كافر مرتد يستتاب فان تاب والا قتل مع انه كانت قبلة لكن نسخ ذلك فكيف بمن يتخذها مكانا (٢٥) يطاف به كما يطاف بالكعبة والطواف بغير الكعبة لم يشرعه الله بحال

وكذلك من قصد ان يسوق اليها غنما او بقرا ليذبحها هناك ويعتقد ان الاضحية فيها افضل وان يحلق (٢٦) فيها شعره في العيد وان يسافر اليها ليعرف بها عشة عرفة فهذه الامور التي يشبه بها بيت المقدس في الوقوف والطواف والذبح والحلق من البدع والضلالات ومن فعل شيئا من ذلك معتقدا ان هذا قرابة الى الله فانه يستتاب فان تاب والا قتل كما الوصل الى الصخرة معتقدا ان استقبالها في الصلوة قرابة كاستقبال الكعبة ولهذا بني عمر بن الخطاب مصل المسلمين في مقدم المسجد الاقصى فان المسجد الاقصى اسم لجميع المسجد الذي بناه سليمان عم وقد صار بعض الناس (٢٧) يسمي الاقصى المصل الذي بناه عمر رض في مقدمه والصلاة في هذا المصل الذي بناه عمر للمسلمين افضل من الصلاة في سائر المسجد

قال عمر بن الخطاب لما فتح البيت المقدس وكان على الصخرة زبالة عظيمة لان النصارى كانوا يقصدون اهانتها مقابلة اليهود الذين (٢٨) يصلون اليها فامر عمر رض بازالة النجاسة عنها وقال لكعب الاحبار اين ترى ان نبني مصل المسلمين فقال خلف الصخرة قال يا ابن اليهودية خالطتك يهودية بل ابنه امامها فان لنا صدور المساجد ولهذا كان ائمة الامة اذا دخلوا المسجد قصدوا الصلاة (٢٩) في المصل الذي بناه عمر وقد روى ان عمر رض انه صلى في محراب داود (٣٠) واما الصخرة فلم يصل (٣١) عندها عمر رض ولا الصحابة

ولا كان على عهد الخلفاء الراشدين عليها قبة بل كانت مكشوفة في خلافة عمر وعثمان وعلي ومعاوية ويزيد ومروان ولكن لما تولى ابنه عبد الملك الشام وقع بينه وبين ابن الزبير الفتنة كان الناس (٣٢) يحججون فيجتمعون بابن الزبير فاراد عبد الملك ان يصرف الناس عن ابن الزبير فبنى القبة على الصخرة وكساها في الشتاء والصيف ليرغب الناس في زيارة بيت المقدس ويشغلوا بذلك عن اجتماعهم بابن الزبير واما اهل العلم من الصحابة والتابعين لهم باحسان فلم يكونوا يعظمون (٣٣) الصخرة فانها قبله منسوخة كما ان يوم السبت كان عيدا في شريعة موسى عم ثم نسخ في شريعة محمد صلعم بيوم الجمعة فليس للمسلمين ان يخصصوا يوم السبت ويوم (٣٤) الاحد بعبادة كما تفعل اليهود والنصارى وكذلك الصخرة انما يعظمها (٣٥) اليهود وبعض النصارى

وما يذكره بعض الجهال فيها من ان هناك اثر قدم النبي صلعم او اثر عمامته او غير ذلك فكله كذب واكذب منه من يظن انه موضع قدم الرب (٣٦) وكذلك المكان الذي يذكر انه مهد عيسى عم كذب وانما كان موضع معمودية النصارى وكذلك من زعم ان هناك الصراط والميزان او ان السور الذي يضرب به بين الجنة والنار هو ذلك الحائط المبني شرقي المسجد كذلك تعظيم السلسلة او موضعها ليس مشروعا

- فصل -

وليس بيت المقدس مكانا يقصد للعبادة سوى المسجد الاقصى ولكن (٣٧) اذا زار قبور الموتى تسلم عليهم وترجم عليهم كما كان النبي صلعم يعلم الصحابة فحسن فان النبي صلعم كان يعلم الصحابة اذا زاروا القبور ان يقول احدهم السلام عليكم اهل

الديار من المؤمنين والمؤمنات واثنا ان شاء الله بكم لاحقون
ويرحم الله المستقدمين منا ومنكم والمستأخرين نشاء الله لنا
ولكم العافية اللهم لا تحرمنا اجرهم ولا تعتنا (٣٨) بعدهم وغفر
لنا ولهم

- فصل -

واما زيارة معابد الكفار مثل الموضع المسمى بالقمامة (٣٩) اويت
لحم او صهيون او غير ذلك ومثل كنائس النصارى فمنهى عنها فمن
زار مكانا من هذه الامكنة معتقدا ان زيارته مستحبة والعبادة فيه
افضل من العبادة في بيته فهو ضال خارج عن شريعة الاسلام بل
يستتاب فان تاب والا قتل واما اذا دخلها الانسان لحاجة وعرضه
له الصلاة فيها فللعلماء فيها ثلاثة اقوال في مذهب احمد وغيره قيل
تكره الصلاة فيها مطلقا واختاره ابن عقيل وهو منقول عن مالك
وقيل بياح مطلقا (٤٠) وقيل ان كان فيها صور ينهي عن الصلاة والا
فلا وهذا منصوص احمد وغيره وهو مروى عن عمر بن (٤١)
الخطاب رضى وغيره عن النبي صلعم قال لا تدخل الملائكة بيتا
فيه صورة ولما فتح النبي صلعم مكة كان في الكعبة تماثيل فلم
يدخل الكعبة حتى محيت تلك الصور والله اعلم

- فصل -

وليس بيت المقدس مكانا يسمى حرما ولا بتربة الخليل ولا
بغير ذلك من البقاع الا ثلاثة اماكن احدها (٤٢) هو حرم باتفاق
المسلمين وهو حرم مكة شرفها الله تعالى والثاني حرم عند جمهور
العلماء وهو حرم النبي صلعم من غير الى ثور يريد في يريد (٤٣)
فان هذا حرم عند جمهور العلماء كمالك والشافعي واحمد وفيه
احاديث صحيحة مستفيضة عن النبي صلعم والثالث وج وهو

وادي (٤٤) بالطائف فان هذا روي فيه حديث رواه (٤٥) احمد في المسند وليس في الصحاح وهذا احرم عند الشافعي لاعتقاده صحة الحديث وليس حرم عند اكثر العلماء واحمد ضعف الحديث المروي فيه فلم يأخذ به واما ما سوى هذه الاماكن الثلاثة فليس حرما عند احد من علماء المسلمين فان الحرم ما حرم الله صيده ونباته ولم يحرم الله صيد مكان ونباته خارجا عن هذه الاماكن الثلاثة

- فصل -

واما زيارة بيت المقدس فمشروعة في جميع الاوقات ولكن لا ينبغي ان توءتى في الاوقات التي (٤٦) يقصدها الظلال (٤٧) مثل وقت عيد النحر فان كثيرا من الظلال (٤٨) يسافرون اليه ليقفوا هناك والسفر اليه لاجل التعريف به معتقدا ان هذا قرية محرم بلا ريب وينبغي ان لا يتشبه بهم ولا يكثر سوادهم وليس السفر اليه مع (٤٩) الحج قرية وقول القائل قدس حجتك قول باطل لا اصل له كما يروى من زارني وزار ابي في عام واحد (٥٠) ضمنت له الجنة فان هذا كذب باتفاق اهل المعرفة بالحديث

وكذلك كل حديث يروى في زيارة قبر النبي صلعم فانه ضعيف بل موضوع ولم يرو اهل السنن والصحاح والمساند كمسند احمد وغيره من ذلك شيئا ولكن الذي في السنن ما رواه ابو داود عن النبي صلعم انه قال ما من رجل يسلم علي الا رد الله على روعي حتى ارد عليه السلام فهو يرد السلام على من سلم عليه عند قبره ويبلغ سلام من سلم (٥١) عليه من البعيد كما في النسائي عنه انه قال ان الله وكل بقبري ملائكة يبلغون عن امتي السلام وفي السنن عنه انه قال اكثروا علي من الصلاة يوم الجمعة وليلة الجمعة فان صلاتكم معروضة علي قالوا كيف تعرض صلاتنا عليك وقد ارمت

فقال ان الله قد حرم على الارض ان تأكل لحوم الانبياء فيئن صلعم ان الصلاة والسلام توصل اليه من البعيد والله قد امرنا ان نصلي عليه ونسلم وثبت في الصحيح انه قال من صلى علي مرة صلى الله عليه عشرا صلى الله عليه وسلم تسليما كثيرا

- فصل -

واما السفر الى عسقلان في هذه الاوقات فليس مشروعاً (٥٢) لا واجب ولا مستحب ولكن عسقلان كان لسكانها وقصدها فضيلة لما كانت ثغراً للمسلمين يقيم بها المرابطون في سبيل الله فانه قد ثبت في صحيح مسلم عن سليمان عن النبي صلعم انه قال رباط يوم وليلة في سبيل الله خير من صيام شهر وقيامه ومن مات مرابطاً مات مجاهداً واجري عليه عمله واجري عليه رزقه من الجنة وامن الفتان وقال ابو هريرة رضى لان رباط (٥٣) ليلة في سبيل الله احب علي من ان اقوم ليلة القدر عند الحجر الاسود وكان هذا خير

والذين يقصدون ثغور المسلمين للرباط فيها ثغور الشام كعسقلان وعكة وطرسوس (٥٤) وجبل لبنان وغيرها وثغور مصر كالاسكندرية وغيرها وثغور العراق كعبدان وغيرها فما خرب من هذه البقاع ولم يبق بيوتا كعسقلان لم يكن ثغراً ولا في السفر اليه فضيلة وكذلك جبل لبنان وامثاله من الجبال لا يستحب السفر اليه وليس فيه احد من الصالحين المتبعين لشريعة الاسلام

ولكن فيه كثير من الجن وهم رجال الغيب الذين يرون احيانا في هذه البقاع قال الله تعالى وانه كان رجال من الانس يعوذون برجال من الجن فزادوهم دهقا (٥٥) وكذلك الذين يرون الخضر احيانا هو جنى رآوه وقد رآه (٥٦) غير واحد ممن عرفه وقال

انني الخضر وكان ذلك جنيا لبس على المسلمين الذين رأوه
والا فالخضر الذي كان مع موسى عم مات ولو كان حيا على عهد
رسول الله صلعم لوجب عليه ان يأتني الى النبي صلعم ويؤمن به
ويجاهد معه فان الله فرض على كل نبي ادرك محمدا ولو كان
من الانبياء ان يؤمنوا به ويجاهدوا معه كما قال الله تعالى واذ
اخذ الله ميثاق النبيين لما آتيتكم من كتاب وحكمة ثم جاءكم
رسول مصدق لما معكم لتؤمنن به ولتنصرنه قال ااقرتم واخذتم
على ذلك اصرى قالوا اقررنا قال فاشهدوا وانا معكم من
الشاهدين (٥٧)

قال ابن عباس رض لم يبعث الله نبيا الا اخذ الله عليه
الميثاق ان بعث محمدا وهو حي ليؤمنن به ولينصرنه وامره ان
ياخذ الميثاق على امته لئن بعث محمدا وهم احياء ليؤمنن به
ولينصرنه ولم يذكر احد من الصحابة انه رأى الخضر ولا انه
اتى الى النبي صلعم فان الصحابة كانوا اعلم واجل قدرا من ان
يلبس الشيطان عليهم ولكن لبس على كثير من بعدهم فصار يتمثل
لاحدهم في صورة النبي (٥٨) ويقول انا الخضر وانا هو شيطان كما ان
كثير من الناس يرى ميتة خرج وجاء اليه وكلمه في امور وقضى
حوائج فيظنه الميت نفسه وانا هو شيطان تصور بصورته

وكثير من الناس يستغيث بمخلوق اما نصراني كجرجس او
غير نصراني فإراه قد جاء وربما يكلمه وانا هو شيطان تصور
بصورة ذلك المستغاث به لما اشرك المستغيث تصور له كما كانت
الشياطين تدخل في الاصنام وتكلم الناس ومثل هذا ما وجد
كثيرا (٥٩) في هذه الازمان في كثير من البلاد ومن هؤلاء (٦٠)
من تحمله الشياطين فتطير به في الهواء الى مكان بعيد ومنهم من
تحمله الى عرفة فلا يحج حجا شرعيا ولا يحرم ولا يلبي ولا
يطوف ولا يسعى ولكن يقف بشابه مع الناس ثم يحملونه الى

بلده وهذا من تلعب الشياطين بكثير من الناس كما قد بسط الكلام
في غير هذا الموضع والله اعلم بصواب
وصلى الله على نبينا (٦١) محمد وآله وصحبه وسلم
تمت بعون الله (٦٢)

¹ The heading of the *Kitāb al-Ba'alabakiyyeh* adds الحرائي.

² MS. has نسهده.

³ MS. بالاله, one of the many examples of careless or ignorant writing.

⁴ MS. تسليم.

⁵ MS. confused here by dittog. from below, then corrected by crossing out.

⁶ MS. نخلثة.

⁷ MS. المسلمين.

⁸ The MS. has الصلاة and الصلوة indiscriminately; I leave it so.

⁹ MS. روه.

¹⁰ MS. يام.

¹¹ MS. ولعمرة.

¹² MS. يكون.

¹³ MS. الوجوب.

¹⁴ MS. اما لو.

¹⁵ MS. اتيا.

¹⁶ MS. وجب.

¹⁷ One elif in crowded writing for او والسلام.

¹⁸ MS. مسي.

¹⁹ MS. و.

²⁰ Our rationalistic puritan does not try (or desire) to attack the Night-Journey tradition, so miraculously colored. As is seen at the end, he also believes in the Jinn and the Shayāṭin and their malevolent powers.

²¹ MS. يصلي.

²² MS. موسي.

²³ MS. هوائي and omits لا .

²⁴ MS. غير. The temporary qibla is made much of in other books.

²⁵ MS. مكان.

²⁶ Cf. Paul, Acts 21. 24; 18. 18. On the point just above, a typical tradition is recorded in *Bā'ith an-Nufūs*, ch. 4: "On authority of Makhūl it is reported (that Mohammed said), Whoever drives sacrificial animals to Jerusalem shall enter Paradise carefully guided, and shall visit all the Prophets in Paradise, and they shall envy him in his relationship with Allah the Mighty and Glorious!"

²⁷ MS. إلنا; just as *al-Masjid al-Aqṣā* means often the entire Ḥaram area, so Beit al-Maqdis or al-Beit al-Muqaddas often means the whole sacred land of Palestine. In connection with the argument against the ceremony of *circuiting* anything but the Ka'ba, it would of course be impossible to circuit al-Aqsa itself due to its position against the Ḥaram-city wall.

²⁸ MS. الذي.

²⁹ MS. الصلاة.

³⁰ MS. داود at every occurrence.

³¹ MS. يصلي.

³² MS. الناس. This is a nice bit of historical rationalizing. There is a slight confusion in the paragraph from marginal writing of *ijtimā'ihim b'ibn*. . .

³³ MS. uses root عض.

³⁴ MS. ويو.

³⁵ Cf. note 33 and see Wright, I, 6C.

³⁶ LeStrange, *Palestine*, etc., p. 136, from Shams (or Kamal) ad-Din as-Suyuti: "The Footprint seen here is that of the Prophet when he mounted the steed Al Burak to ascend into heaven. In Crusading times it was called Christ's Footprint. . . The place of the Noble Footprint may be seen at this day on a stone that is separate from the Rock . . . to the south-west. This stone is supported on a column."

³⁷ MS. لكن.

³⁸ Prof. Torrey, along with other indispensable help, gave me the following note: "IV is not in the dictionaries; but it is not needed there. The reading is quite proper, and certain. The verb is equivalent to *تَجَبَّرَ*, etc."

³⁹ One wonders whether this for the Church of the Resurrection (*al-Qiyāma*) is merely a term of opprobrium or a transfer of the *subāla* from

the Ḥaram. If the tradition of the malicious *subāla* is correct, then the term *al-Qumāma* is deserved!

⁴⁰ Mu'awiya, on his proclamation as caliph in Jerusalem, is said to have prayed at "Golgotha," Gethsemane, and the Tomb of Mary. I have forgotten the reference.

⁴¹ MS. ابن.

⁴² MS. أحدهما.

⁴³ I. e., "from 'Air to Thaur, one station after another." A tradition, Prof. Torrey informs me, designed to define the Ḥaram region of Medina—troublesome because the mountain 'Air is at Medina and that of Thaur at Mekka. Some, he continues, resolve the difficulty by asserting there was also an 'Air at Mekka and that the distance between the two mountains was the measure for the Medina region. But the authorities say the true

reading is من بين غير إلى أحد.

⁴⁴ MS. ود.

⁴⁵ MS. روه.

⁴⁶ MS. الذي.

⁴⁷ Pl. of ظل, "people, persons," as Prof. Torrey informs me.

⁴⁸ Cf. note 47. MS. has both times الطلال.

⁴⁹ MS. معا.

⁵⁰ An opinion from a valued source was that the text should read من زارني ولا رابني, and that the meaning was that the tradition making Jerusalem a place of *Hajj* was as false as the one in which Mohammed is made to say any group visiting him, not doubting him, in any single year would be given Paradise as their reward. I wrote at first وزار ابني, taking the tradition as metaphorical for Jerusalem and Medina or Mecca. But now I see the hamza above the elif, and also that the dot I took for that of a nūn (in the end word of a line) is part of a perpendicular line of dots, along the edge of the text. So reading here أبي, and taking the في عام واحد to necessitate consideration of two factors, I believe the reference is to Abraham and Mohammed. In ch. 3 of the *Bā'ith an-Nufūs* there are several traditions on the merit of making pilgrimage to Jerusalem and Mecca in the same year. Abraham or Hebron may be used for Jerusalem or Palestine generally.

⁵¹ MS. سلام.

⁵² MS. مشروع and below, بُعِر. Many works on the merits of Jerusalem and Palestine include sections on Asqalon, as in some later copies of the *Bā'ith*. Cf. MS. No. 4 under No. 6094 in Ahlwardt's catalogue, Berlin.

⁵³ MS. اربط.

⁵⁴ The noted name, at end of line, is divided—as is the case with numerous words in this text so illustrative of decline in calligraphic art.

⁵⁵ Sura 72. 6.

⁵⁶ MS. رأه.

⁵⁷ Sura 3. 75; MS. فشهدوا.

⁵⁸ Perhaps better نبي, not to confuse with Mohammed.

⁵⁹ MS. موجود كثير. Better as here printed, or موجود.

⁶⁰ MS. هؤلاء.

⁶¹ نبي نا.

⁶² As best I can tell on my film copy, there are written at the lower left-hand corner of this last page the words رسالة لشيخ الاسلام. On the adjoining page the next division of the Yale codex continues: شيخ الاسلام بن تيمية في تفسير ايات اشكلت حتى لا يوجد في طائفة من كتب التفسير فيها قولاً صواباً بل لا يوجد فيها الا ما هو خطأ منها قوله تعالى I append here also references from the catalogues it was my opportunity to consult while attending at Princeton the summer of 1935 the Oriental Seminar under direction of Prof. Hitti and auspices of the ACLS: Loth, Cat. of the Ar. MSS. in the Lib. of the India Office, II—No. 467, Ibn T.'s reply to a question regarding the attributes of perfection, صفات الكمال. DeSlane's Cat. of the Ar. MSS. in the Bib. Ntle., Paris—Nos. 243-4, Anc. Fonds 980, Ibn T.'s السياسة الشرعية في الراعي والرعية; No. 2962 (2), his مسئلة الكنائس, supporting Muslim action in closing some Christian churches in Cairo; No. 3412 (4), a *qasida* of his. Ahlwardt's cat. of the Ar. MSS. in the Preussische Staatsbib., Berlin, a total of 37 works and references! (vol. 22 of the general catalogue of MSS., vol. 10 of the Arabic), of which some of the most interesting—No. 1994; No. 2054, quoting a poem of Ibn T. of 102 verses, on *free-will*, in a book by احمد بن كتاب الفرقان في اولياء الرحمن واولياء; Nos. 2082-3, محمد الصندي (Kutubī in Bulāq edn. has وحزب الشيطان); the cat. states Ibn T. wrote over 300 works, and says this No. 2080, etc., contain an elegy over him by Ismā'il b. Moh. b. Bardas, 74 vss., *basit* (Landberg 1019); No. 2084 quotes a few vss. of his; No. 2096, a defense of Ibn T. by برهان الدين شمس الدين عبد الله بن قيم (who is related to ابراهيم بن قيم الجوزي? See below); No. 10128 (Landberg 158), a biog. of Ibn T., com-

posite, from various materials, entitled: كتاب الكواكب الدرية في مناقب
مرعي بن يوسف الكرعي الحنبلي, author: المجتهد بن تيمية
1618, with numerous elegies at the end. Ibn T.'s كتاب الايمان was published
in Cairo in 1325/1907, and his القياس في الشرع الاسلامي, with Shams
ad-Din 'Abdullāh b. Qayyim al-Jauziyah, in Cairo, in 1927. L. E. Brown,
The Eclipse of Christianity in Asia, Cambridge University Press, 1933,
mentions in his bibliography p. 191, that there was published in Cairo in
1905/1322 Ibn Taimiyyeh's "Al-jawāb aṣ-ṣaḥiḥ li-man baddala dīn al-
Masīḥ." As we learn from the above references, our author's name was:
قهي الدين ابو العباس احمد بن الامام ابي المحاسن عبد الحلیم بن
الامام مجد الدين ابي البركات عبد السلام بن تيمية.



STUDIES IN SEMITIC FORMATIVES

E. A. SPEISER

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

THE FORMATIVES, or non-inflexional prefixes and affixes, constitute perhaps the most neglected field in the study of comparative Semitic grammar. The treatment of these elements is confined as a rule to mere tabulations. We find lists of prefixes, affixes, and occasionally of infixes, capable of modifying the meaning of nominal and verbal bases in one form or another, but little has been done towards ascertaining the original values and functions of such determinants. Of late there have been isolated indications that the subject may soon come into its own. Concrete results cannot be expected, however, for some time to come. It will require the concerted efforts of many scholars and much constructive discussion and criticism before real progress has been made in this particular department of Semitic linguistics.

At two successive annual meetings of the American Oriental Society I discussed certain aspects of this problem and submitted general conclusions. My principal purpose was to direct attention to a virtually untapped field. The subjects discussed were "The So-called Causative Conjugation" and "The So-called Feminine Ending (*a*)*t*." The inadequacy of our knowledge of these topics is reflected fairly well by these qualified titles. To test the validity of my tentative conclusions these papers are now summed up in printed form. The statements are far from complete. A thorough treatment of each subject would call for a monograph of respectable proportions. The next best thing is to confine illustrative material and references¹ to the barest minimum, and to concen-

¹ The following abbreviations are used below: *GBA* = *Grammatik des Biblisch-aramäischen*; *HGH* = *Historische Grammatik der Hebräischen Sprache*. Bergsträsser, *Einführung* = *Einführung in die semitischen Sprachen*; *Verbum* = *Hebräische Grammatik II: Verbum*. Brockelmann, *GVG* = *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der semitischen Sprachen*. Gardiner, *Eg. Gr.* = *Egyptian Grammar*. Gray, *ICSL* = *Introduction to Comparative Semitic Linguistics*. *JRAS* = *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*. Meinhof, *Hamiten* = *Die Sprachen der Hamiten*. *MO* = *Le Monde Oriental*. *ZA* = *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie*.

trate instead on a brief presentation of the actual problems. Requirements of space dictate the latter course.²

I. The "Causative" Conjugation

As is well known, Semitic contrives to enrich its basic vocabulary by means of derivative conjugations which modify, shade, or emphasize in one respect or another the primary meaning of a given verbal base. Grammarians have come to designate these secondary stems as intensive, reflexive, causative, and the like. These terms are convenient for purposes of general classification; but they convey no more than a very superficial idea of the wealth of nuances that a secondary conjugation in Semitic is capable of expressing. Particularly inadequate from this standpoint is the label "causative," attached by grammarians to a derivative stem which is represented prominently in all Semitic languages.

This stem is developed from the primary base with the aid of one of several prefixes, in the choice of which the various members of the family display a certain degree of individuality. Thus Akkadian (Akk.) employs the prefix *š-*, Minaean (Min.) has *s-*, Hebrew (Heb.), Sabaean (Sab.), and Mehri use *h-*, and Arabic (Arab.) and Ethiopic (Eth.) have the glottal stop ' ; all four elements are found among the Aramaic (Aram.) dialects, while Phoenician (Phoen.) acquires in course of time a *y*-prefix. The causative connotation is present throughout, to be sure: the addition of the proper prefix to, say, *qbr* 'bury' imparts to the stem the meaning 'cause to bury.' But this particular significance of the new stem is only one of many. The same conjugation may yield on occasions a factitive, declarative, or perfective sense; it may express momentary action as opposed to the durative connotation of the primary stem; it may have even the value of a passive, as when it is employed to indicate the result of action in the case of certain verbs.³ In short, the term "causative" is

² Wherever a single example from any given language of the group is a sufficiently clear illustration of the entire category under discussion, no other illustrations have been cited.

³ Cf. H. S. Nyberg, "Wortbildung mit Suffixen in den semitischen Sprachen," *MO* XIV (1920). 250 ff. Nyberg's monograph (*ibid.* 177-290) is an extensive historical treatment of the Semitic prefixes which is sound methodologically and thoroughly consistent with the requirements of

wholly inadequate. If we retain it in the present discussion it is so mainly for the sake of convenience; the designation has been in use too long to be readily displaced.⁴ It will be demonstrated, I trust, that the numerous and apparently unrelated uses of the stem under discussion derive directly from the peculiar origin of this conjugation.

It should be made clear at the outset that the causative stem is proto-Semitic and that it has an exact counterpart in Hamitic. The same wide range of meanings confronts us throughout, and the morphological relationship of the respective bases is equally apparent in all instances. The only divergence, then, is in the choice of the characteristic prefix. We have seen that several of them are in use. It may be added that their semantic functions are identical. For whether *pqd* 'heed' is equipped with an initial *š-* in Akk., *h-* in Heb., or *'-* in Aram., the meaning will be in each case 'put in charge,' or the like. The disparity is solely on the phonetic side. It is not as wide, however, as might seem at first. To begin with, *š* and *s* represent one original sound: Semitic *š* maintains itself in Akk., but changes to *s* in the South Semitic group (represented here by Min.) in accordance with a perfectly normal sound-shift. Within the Akk. group Assyrian exhibits a dialectal shift to *s*, and the sporadic *s* of Aram. may be ascribed to dialectal influences.⁵ Since Phoen. *y* does not represent an original prefix,⁶ we are left ultimately with three causative prefixes: one sibilant (*š/s-*) and the laryngeal ones (*h-*, *'-*).

modern linguistic science. Although I am unable to accept the author's final conclusions with regard to the origin of the causative stem, and while I must take exception to a number of his etymologies, particularly in the Akk. group, I herewith make grateful acknowledgement of the stimulating effect of this admirable study.

⁴ Nyberg, *op. cit.*, employs the phrase "the fourth form," which is suitable for Arab., but awkward and misleading in the case of the other Semitic languages.

⁵ Cf. Brockelmann, *GVG* I. 526 and Bauer-Leander, *GBA* 92 k. The Aram. causatives with the prefix *š-* may safely be ascribed to Akk. influence, cf. *ibid.* 116 y. The original Aram. causative prefixes are thus reduced to the laryngeal group, on which see below. For the causative elements in the dialect of Ras Shamra see note 17.

⁶ For this causative element the reader may be referred to the forthcoming *Grammar of Phoenician*, by Zellig S. Harris (American Oriental Series, vol. 8).

The question now arises whether a further reduction could not be justified by the laws of Semitic phonology. In the case of *h*- and ' - the problem is comparatively simple. In Aram. *h*- is found in the older dialects, while ' - comes to prevail at a later stage. In the South Semitic group we have *h*- in Sab. and Mehri, but ' - normally in Arab. and Eth.⁷ Do we have instances of a direct shift from *h* to ' ? Such a change cannot be demonstrated as yet as a regular procedure, certainly not in Arab., although the correspondence is observable there in certain isolated words. But an ' - prefix might develop from *h*- by the process of back-formation: since the "impf." **yu-haqtilu* may lead, as it actually does in Heb., to a form simplified through elision (**yu/aqtilu*), the "perf." modeled after it would be **aqtala*. Arab. and some of the Aram. dialects would have thus specialized this secondary prefix, while *h*- was restored in Heb. and Bibl. Aram. on the analogy of the "perf."⁸ In other words, the two laryngeal causative prefixes go back in all probability to a single one (*h*-). This would leave us with two formatives, *š*- and *h*-.

Attempts have been made to effect further simplification by postulating an original connection between these two sounds: the *h*-prefix is regarded as a phonetic development from an earlier sibilant element, which maintained itself, however, in certain dialects. But for all the ingenuity displayed by the advocates of such

⁷ We are concerned at present with the principal prefix in each language, presumably representing, or developed from, its original causative element. For traces of rival elements see Nyberg, *op. cit.* Such sporadic occurrences may be due to a variety of causes: material inherited from the proëthnic period, later interdialectal borrowing, etc.; but they are confined to the noun class, except for Aram. and Ras Shamra, where Akk. influence, easily accounted for on geographic and cultural grounds, is to be assumed. The point to be made at present is that ' - is the sole living causative prefix in Arab. and Eth. just as *h*- alone is operative in Heb. and *š*- in Akk. The history of the Aram. dialects shows ' - to be later than *h*-, and this chronological sequence is of value for the purposes of the discussion below.

⁸ This position is taken by Bauer-Leander in *HGH* 228 é, cf. *GBA* 62 r, though the authors later express some misgivings, *ibid.* 113. Nevertheless, it is the only theory that accounts at once for the developments in both Arab. and Aram. It is true that in later Aram. dialects, such as Mandaic, *h* is reduced to a glottal stop; but this reduction would not apply to earlier times. The assumption of an analogic back-formation provides therefore the most satisfactory explanation.

For the "perfect" and "imperfect" see below, p. 34.

a phonetic change,⁹ the two sounds have not been successfully united.¹⁰ It is quite true that the sibilant occurs in Akk., the oldest documented member of the Semitic family, and that it is characteristic of the Hamitic group,^{10a} which has retained many archaic features of the larger Hamito-Semitic stock. The difficulty is that there is no evidence for a common Semitic shift of š (or s) to h in any position. Thus e. g., 'nine' is *tīšu* in Akk., *tis'u* in Arab., and *téša* in Heb.; no trace here of any dialectal shift to h. The same holds true of practically all the available comparative lexical material.¹¹ Since, then, the languages that employ a laryngeal causative prefix do not show any tendency to a normal shift of š/s to h in any position whatever, a phonetic relationship between the causative prefixes in question must definitely be ruled out. This is indeed the prevailing opinion among the latest writers on the subject. Some of them would go even further: a common origin of the causative elements having proved impossible, they see no immediate reason for reducing the number of prefixes to two; they would concede independence to ' as well.¹² In the final analysis, two causative prefixes in Semitic represent the irreducible minimum, and quite probably also the original maximum.¹³

It is clear that the semantic functions of these elements must have been identical. This circumstance is evidently responsible for the usual statement that each causative prefix had the value of 'cause, make.'¹⁴ Does this mean that we have here violently re-

⁹ Cf. P. Joüon, *Mélanges de la Faculté orientale de l'Univ. St.-Joseph à Beyrouth* 1913. 125-28; Barton, *Semitic and Hamitic Origins* 22 and 365 f.; I inclined to a similar view in *JQR* NS. XXIII. 248, note 90.

¹⁰ Brockelmann, *GVG* I. 521; Barth, *Pronominalbildung* 13; Bergsträsser, *Verbum* 107.

^{10a} Cf. Gardiner, *Eg. Gr.* 212, and Meinhof, *Hamiten* 18. Cf. also Barton, *op. cit.*, and the very useful comparative tables at the end of that work.

¹¹ For the initial consonants in the personal pronouns see below. In Mehri š changes in certain roots to h, cf. Bergsträsser, *Einführung* 126. But the limited number of these changes and the comparative lateness of the dialect make it impossible to regard these phenomena as survivals from the earliest period of Semitic; we have here instead late and isolated developments.

¹² Nyberg, *MO* XIV. 250; Bauer-Leander, *GBA* 62 r.

¹³ An ultimate connection of h and ' is indicated by Bergsträsser, *Einführung* 12.

¹⁴ Cf. e. g., Haupt, *JAOS* 28. 114, and the criticism of Brockelmann, *GVG* I. 521.

duced forms of so many verbs, each with the same original connotation, but none apparently preserved in full in historic times? ¹⁵ Such a theory is not only transparently simple but also manifestly untenable. For the causative significance is, as we have seen, but one of many functions of the conjugation in question. If we operate exclusively with 'make,' we shall not get very far in our effort to account for the remaining connotations of our stem.

A solution of the problem is indicated, rather unexpectedly, from a different quarter. The Semitic personal pronouns for the third person exhibit virtually the same variations of initial sounds that we have found in the causative prefixes. One group of dialects employs š/s-, while the remaining languages use h-. Thus Akk. has šū 'he,' šī 'she,' and Min. uses s-forms; elsewhere we find h-pronouns, with the exception of Mehri which presents both types in *he* 'he' and *se* 'she.' ¹⁶ Apart from this single departure we find that the sibilant pronoun occurs precisely in those languages in which there is also a sibilant causative prefix, while the h-pronoun is accompanied in the other dialects by a corresponding causative element. ¹⁷ This noteworthy harmony pervades also the Hamitic group; e.g., by the side of the Egyptian causative prefix s- we find the pronouns šw 'he' and šy 'she.' ¹⁸ Such striking regularity over a wide field seems to preclude any possibility of mere coincidence. Apparently, there is a deeper connection between these seemingly heterogeneous elements.

¹⁵ Is the statement of Bauer-Leander, *HGH* 283 to be understood in this sense?

¹⁶ Cf. Brockelmann, *GVG* I. 302 f.; Barth, *Pronominalbildung* 14 ff.

¹⁷ It is significant in this connection that the languages employing a causative prefix with ' have h-pronouns (in Eth. the initial h was subsequently lost). This may be regarded as an indirect confirmation of the view that within the causative elements the ' developed from an earlier h-. Moreover, where several prefixes occur at the same time, as in Aram., the pronoun is likely to point to the original causative element. The dialect of Ras Shamra is a case in point. There we encounter a number of š-causatives, but these are confined for the most part to verbs of cultic use and are thus evidently Akk. loanwords; cf. Montgomery and Harris, *The Ras Shamra Mythological Texts* 22. On the other hand, causatives with a laryngeal prefix are definitely established in such *tertiae* verbal forms as *ymši*' (with an i-containing '), while other occurrences are certain from the context (*loc. cit.*). It is noteworthy, therefore, that the pronoun 'he' was probably *hwt* (*ibid.* 19).

¹⁸ Gardiner, *Bg. Gr.* 45.

At first one might again be tempted to operate with the theory of phonetic relationship. Could not the laryngal go back, after all, to a sibilant in both instances? It has been indicated, however, that Semitic does not show a regular shift of \check{s}/s to h . Against this correspondence of the two sounds in two grammatical categories we have the uniformly negative testimony of the entire lexical material. Moreover, Mehri employs both forms of the pronoun; if the masc. had been subjected to the shift, there is no sound reason why the fem. should have been spared. To sum up, a phonetic explanation must be ruled out in both cases; and to ascribe such manifold and detailed correspondences to mere coincidence would require more faith than linguistic study can afford to utilize.

In this contingency only one solution remains open to us: there must be an ultimate semantic connection between the Semitic causative prefixes and the personal pronouns of the third person. In other words, if it could be shown that these pronouns entered into the make-up of the causative stems, our principal difficulty would disappear. Let us concentrate for the moment on the pronouns. If Heb. $h\ddot{u}$ did not develop from the prototype of Akk. $\check{s}\ddot{u}$, it follows that primitive Semitic had both forms available for the purpose of indicating the third person. Just how this duplication originated is beyond our present means to ascertain; we may have here specialization of two out of several originally demonstrative pronouns. At all events, the conviction is gaining ground that h occurred originally with mascs., \check{s} with fems., the earlier forms being $*h\ddot{u}a$ 'he' and $*\check{s}\ddot{u}a$ 'she.'¹⁹ Since the difference in vowels was sufficient to indicate the gender,²⁰ the consonantal distinction was given up, one group of dialects ultimately retaining the sibilant while the other chose the laryngal. Both types can be traced back, at any rate, to primitive Semitic. Now if these pronouns

¹⁹ The situation in Mehri (see above; but cf. note 11) is responsible for the now practically universal view that the original division was h - for the masc. and \check{s} - for the fem.; cf. Brockelmann (who cites Jensen and Ugnad), *GVG* I. 302 f., Barth, *Pronominalbildung* 13, Bauer-Leander, *HGH* 249, Bergsträsser, *Einführung* 8. In view of this well-established position I cannot understand the statement of Gray, *ISOL* 63, note 1, that he is indebted for the same hypothesis to one of his pupils, even though the latter's reasoning is somewhat different (and, incidentally, not uniformly clear).

²⁰ I take it that Gray, *loc. cit.*, implies the same thing.

were used in the causative stem, the prefixes would reflect necessarily the consonantal dichotomy. After the equipment had been simplified through the operation of linguistic economy, those dialects that had retained the sibilant pronouns would naturally show also a sibilant causative, with analogous results in the laryngeal group.²¹ So far the reasoning has been comparatively simple. The main problem, however, is to show what business the pronouns had with the causatives.

The problem is not properly one of phonology or morphology, but essentially one of syntax. Derivative stems are often shortened or elliptical forms of what were formerly fuller sentences. In causatives we have really the remains of compound sentences. Thus Akk. *uṣabnî* 'he caused to build' implies that A had ordered or induced B to build (a house, shrine, or whatever the case might be). We have here two distinct subjects. A is the superimposed subject, the principal actor, while B is the secondary agent,²² impersonal unless otherwise specified (by means of special suffixes). B stands thus for 'someone, anyone else'; this agent is expressed by the stem prefix.

The above analysis applies, of course, exclusively to transitive verbs, and consequently to causative stems proper. The matter becomes more complicated when we consider other functions of the Semitic stem in question. Let us first examine the type having a declarative value. Heb. *hirsî'a* may be translated by 'he declared (or denounced) as guilty.' Our translation is plainly incapable of conveying the force of the original, of which it is merely a paraphrase. It is the direct result of the elliptical nature of the underlying sentence, infinitely flexible because any number of predicates of the superimposed subject could be implied: A has declared, demonstrated, or the like, that B is guilty. Again our nondescript B is represented by the so-called causative prefix.

Other types of our stem may be analyzed in the same manner. They will be found to represent original clauses following verbs

²¹ The one exception to this rule (discounting sporadic rival forms like the Aram. *š*-causatives) would be the Arab *istaqtala* conjugation. Here, however, the addition of the *t*-infix was apparently responsible for the selection of the *s*-element, *st* being simpler to pronounce than *ht*. I hesitate to make chronological deductions concerning the time of final specialization of the one or the other causative prefix on this basis alone.

²² Cf. Nyberg, *MO* XIV. 250.

expressing causation, command, belief, putation, and the like. The numerous nuances of the stem are obviously due in large measure to the possible multiplicity of the implied governing verbs.

The stem is not limited, however, to the function of verbal sentences. Such a form as Heb. *he'ēdim* 'has turned red' is clearly the equivalent of a nominal sentence that has nothing to do with the type of clauses discussed above. Is it not strange, then, that the same stem should be employed for two such heterogeneous types of sentence? The answer is bound up intimately with the peculiarities of Semitic syntax; and it promises to furnish a satisfactory solution of the whole problem.

It has been abundantly demonstrated that nominal sentences predominate in the early stages of Semitic. There is no specific copula. For the purposes of particular emphasis, however, the pronoun of the third person might serve as copula. To call attention to the fact that 'the wool is actually, unexpectedly, outstandingly, or permanently white' the ancient Semite would use the equivalent of 'the wool, *it* white.' Here we see rather plainly the original demonstrative value of the later personal pronoun. This pronoun can be interposed even when a different person expresses the subject; cf. e. g., Aram. *ānahā himmō 'aḇdōhī* 'we, they His servants,' i. e., 'we are truly His servants.'²³

We have now an adequate explanation for the use of this "pronoun of separation" or "pronoun of support," as it is called by Arab grammarians,²⁴ in the type of verbal sentences mentioned in the foregoing discussion. It must be borne in mind that in place of hypotaxis the ancient Semite resorted to paratactic or asyndetic construction. The phrase 'A orders (wishes, etc.) that B build a house' was actually construed as 'A orders, B builds the house.' In such asyndetic *that*-clauses particular emphasis was needed to make clear that a given action was to be performed by someone, or that a given quality was attributed to someone or something. The pronoun of the third person, a demonstrative in origin, was evidently the only available means of conveying this idea. It was unavoidable, therefore, that this pronoun should become associated with the *that*-clause in the linguistic consciousness of the speaker. This intimate association made it possible to dispense in course of

²³ Cf. Bergsträsser, *Einführung* 15.

²⁴ *Al-faṣḥā*, or *al-'imādu*, cf. Wright, *Arabic Grammar* II. 258 ff.

time with the governing verb. The specialization of the pronoun, always in a rigidly observed syntactic sequence, as the corollary of the clauses in question, and the frequency and variety of such sentences, led at length to the emergence of the characteristic pronominal element²⁵ as a prefixed stem determinant. In the meantime a similar coalescence was taking place in certain nominal sentences of a declarative character. The ultimate result was the formation of quasi-quadriradical verbal stems, since the new prefix constituted in effect a fourth radical in what had been for the most part a triradical base.²⁶ It is certainly not without significance that the new stem was inflected like other quadriradicals, and this fact accounts for the nature of the vowels in the "causative stem."^{26a}

Two final points may be made by way of illustration. The first

²⁵ I use the term advisedly because I do not wish to imply the joining of the entire pronoun to the verbal base. In that case we should have to explain the origin of the vowel *a* which invariably follows the consonantal element of the prefix. While the presence of this vowel could be connected with the final *a* of the pronouns themselves (**hā'a*, **šā'a* becoming **ha* and **ša* as proclitics), such a view would presuppose deeper insight into proto-Semitic phonology than we can possibly claim at present. Nyberg (*MO* XIV. 263) regards the causative prefixes as original demonstratives (**ha*, **ša*, and **a*), which were joined to a base like **qitil* to yield one of two possible meanings: 'he of slaying,' or 'he who slays.' Such ambiguity was possible, he holds, because verb and noun had not become separated as yet. I doubt that much can be accomplished when one has to go back to the mythological stages of language; were causatives required at so lawless a period? Finally, as Bauer-Leander remark (*GBA* 92 f.), such an assumption would not account for the basic causative connotation of the stem. On the other hand, the syntactic conditions referred to above are demonstrable facts. The coalescence of pronominal and verbal elements which we have assumed, would be guided by the analogy of available verbal forms, leading to the standardization of the stem as a whole.

²⁶ This would presuppose, of course, that such forms with doubling or repetition of the second or third radical, quadriradicals in effect, were earlier than the causatives, an altogether plausible assumption, since the introduction of foreign elements (causative prefix) is likely to be later than operation with available radicals. Causative stems would thus be comparatively late developments of proto-Semitic.

For the treatment of sibilant causatives as "quadriliterals" in Aram. cf. Dalman, *Aramäische Grammatik* 250, and in Egyptian, Gardiner, *Eg. Gr.* 212.

^{26a} I. e., *yusāqtilu* on the analogy of *yugattilu* and *yugatliu*.

concerns the connection of the causative prefix with independently ascertained elements of emphasis. Such a relationship has been seen by few between the causative element of the Arab. verb and the proclitic 'a- of the elative form of the Arab. adjective.²⁷ A similar adjectival formation, though not as regular as in Arab., occurs in Akk. where we have, e. g., *pašqu* 'steep,' by the side of *šupšuqu* 'too steep'; here š- is used for both the causative and the elative.²⁸ An emphasizing function underlies the prefix in both instances.

The other illustration is found in Sumerian. Here the causative elements are -n- and -b-, precisely the same as the two, and only two, subject elements of the third person sing. of the preterite tense. Indeed, Poebel regards the causative elements of Sumerian as accusative infixes of the third person.²⁹ So complete a parallel between two totally different linguistic stocks brings into bolder relief the mode of reasoning that may lead to the formation of causative and related stems.

To sum up, we have noted the correspondence between Semitic causative prefixes and the pronouns of the third person. There being no phonetic justification for these parallel occurrences, and chance correspondence being out of the question, an underlying functional relationship was sought. A common ground has been found in the employment of the pronouns in question as elements of emphasis. Peculiarities of Semitic syntax led to the development of these pronominal elements into so-called causative prefixes.³⁰ The various connotations of the causative stem become intelligible when we take into consideration the variety of possible

²⁷ Cf. Nyberg, *op. cit.*, 269.

²⁸ Christian has published an article entitled "Die kausative Bedeutung des semitischen Steigerungsstammes" in *Analecta Orientalia* 12. Unfortunately, this work is not available to me and I do not know whether our conclusions are similar in this respect.

²⁹ Cf. his *Sumerische Grammatik* 210 and 173. The syntactic function of the Sumerian causative prefixes would thus be slightly different, but their pronominal origin is virtually certain. Incidentally, I had overlooked this exceedingly gratifying parallel when this paper was read in April 1934.

³⁰ It should be pointed out that I do not seek the basis of the stem in full sentences such as 'the king commanded that the house be built.' The final standardized form would represent the ultimate abstraction based on innumerable related statements, in all of which the emphasizing pronoun played a leading part.

verbs implied in the governing verbal sentence, and the character of the Semitic nominal sentence.

II. *The So-called Feminine Ending* -(a)t

The facts concerning the means of expressing gender in Semitic are well known and they are listed in the standard grammars.³¹ Their chronological relationship is less clear. In re-stating briefly the relevant details we shall seek to arrange them in a historical sequence, so far as this is possible. This is an essential prerequisite for our present investigation. For only by establishing the relative date of the ending -(a)t can we hope to obtain some insight into its origin.

To judge from the interrogative pronoun, the earliest classification in Semitic recognized animates and inanimates. At least, the pronoun for person is not further differentiated with regard to masculine and feminine;³² this may be due, however, to the fact that such distinctions were of no use to the speaker. A similar situation confronts us in the case of the personal pronoun of the first person. Here again gender is not indicated, being at all times obvious to the audience. But when a person was being addressed, the gender was specified: by the side of the masc. **antā* 'thou' we have the fem. **antī*, where *ī* obviously serves as gender determinant. This distinction is extended subsequently to the nominal phrase, e. g., **qaribtī* 'thou art near' (fem.), and to the verbal phrase, as in **tāpqiḏī*³³ 'thou heedest.' In all of these categories *ī* serves to indicate the feminine.

The third person, in the pronoun as well as in the verb, displays a marked degree of individuality. It is not bound by the same

³¹ Brockelmann's *GVG* I. 404 ff. contains the most complete statement; for a recent analysis cf. Gray, *ISOL* 48 ff.

³² This applies only to the common *m*-pronoun; cf. Barth, *Pronominalbildung* 137 ff.

³³ That forms like **tāpqiḏī* go back to an earlier **ta-pa/iqid-i* is obvious. But the composite verbal form suffered syncope of the second vowel at some remote stage. At any rate, we need not refer to the possible prototypes of **tāpqiḏī*, which are immaterial for our discussion; the processes with which we are concerned in the present investigation are comparatively late developments of primitive Semitic. The accent on the preformative syllable has been indicated in order to call attention to the loss of a vowel in the following syllable.

laws that govern the other two persons.³⁴ The clearest evidence for this split is furnished by the verb. Here we must distinguish clearly between an originally nominal aspect, the so-called perfect (e. g., 'be near') on the one hand, and a primarily verbal aspect, the so-called imperfect (e. g., 'heed') on the other. The two constitute ultimately the Semitic system of "tenses."³⁵ Inasmuch as the significance of these "tenses" is not historically uniform, it will be best to designate them in the present discussion in accordance with their external characteristics, which render them mutually exclusive. The "perfect" will be termed therefore the suffix conjugation, while the "imperfect" will figure as the prefix conjugation. Now the suffix conjugation forms its first and second persons with the aid of pronominal elements (e. g., **qarib-tā* : **an-tā*); the prefix conjugation yields such forms as **tā-pqid-u*). There can be no doubt that the pronominal elements so used were ultimately the same in both groups.

As regards the third person, however, there was no such harmony in treatment. Here the suffix conjugation shows **qarib-a* 'he is near,' while the prefix conjugation has **yā-pqid-u* 'he heeds.' There is no etymological connection between the above formatives, nor are they related morphologically, as we shall see. Moreover, neither bears any relation to the established Semitic personal pronoun of the third person (masc. **hū'a* or **šū'a*; fem. **šī'a* or **hī'a*); at best, the feminine forms of this pronoun may contain the same characteristic feminine element *i* that has been noted also in the personal pronoun of the second person. In short, the third persons of the two "tenses" of Semitic were formed independently of each other and without the assistance of the

³⁴ Cf. Bergsträsser, *Einführung* 8.

³⁵ The historical difference between the "perfect" and "imperfect" is now generally recognized as is also the inadequacy of the above designations. Bauer-Leander substitute therefore "nominal" and "aorist" respectively, see *HGH* 269, while Gray (*ISOL* 91) has suggested "telic" and "atelic" under the influence of M. Cohen's "accompli" and "inaccompli." Now while "nominal" is entirely acceptable, and suggestive of earlier conditions when the form was primarily a "qualitative" (cf. the formal parallel between this "tense" and the noun in the common employment of suffixes), the term "aorist" restricts unduly the freedom of the "imperfect." Since no single set of terms will do justice to the functional character of the two main aspects of the Semitic verb, it seems best to base our designations on purely external, and definitely contrasted, characteristics.

known personal pronouns. In the first and second persons, however, there is a definite connection between personal pronoun and verb.

This sharp disparity is manifestly the result of differing linguistic stratification: the third person belongs to a later stratum.⁸⁶ The personal pronoun of the third person had not been definitely established at the time when the verbal system was on its way to schematization, and another original demonstrative (**ya*) was used to indicate the third person in the prefix conjugation. But the suffix conjugation never did succumb to this particular system, because it had its own peculiar way to designate the third person.

The *-a* of forms like **qarib-a* 'he is near' cannot be associated directly with the personal pronoun.⁸⁷ There is, however, another explanation for this element, which has hitherto been overlooked. Its occurrence in the suffix conjugation is due to the requirements of Semitic syntax. It so happens that the accusative is the normal case of the predicate in a nominal sentence,⁸⁸ i. e., after a copula, whether the latter is expressed or implied; cf. Arab. *kāna qaribā* 'he was a companion, near.' Now **qarib-a* is in effect such a sentence; and the accusative ending is *-a*. The presence of this ending does away with the need for a special pronominal determinant of person.

It follows that the above form is later than the case endings of Semitic. This result is not surprising, for we have had other indications that the third person of the Semitic verb is a comparatively late development. In the suffix conjugation a case-ending came to designate the person in question owing to the nature of that conjugation and the special laws of Semitic syntax. But since syntax is not restricted by gender, a verbal ending thus obtained would apply automatically to masculine and feminine alike. If, then, the third person feminine was to be differentiated from the corresponding masculine form, a special distinguishing characteristic had to be introduced. Quite appropriately, this new element is also borrowed from the noun. For the *-at* in **qarib-at*

⁸⁶ For this chronological difference in the suffix conjugation cf. Bergsträsser, *Einführung* 14.

⁸⁷ One might think in this connection of the final vowel in the pronouns **hū'a* and **šū'a*; but no special significance appears to attach to it and it may be itself secondary.

⁸⁸ Cf. Bergsträsser, *op. cit.* 15.

'she is near,' or at least the characteristic *-t*, cannot be dissociated from the feminine ending *-(a)t* of the noun group.

What is the origin of this feminine element? Shared by the noun and the verb, and equally prominent in the Semitic and in the Hamitic languages, this ending would seem capable of a satisfactory explanation. Nevertheless, all attempts at deriving the formative from some plausible source have failed thus far. As the transcription *-(a)t* shows, we are not even clear as to its original form. For by the side of *-at* we find also *-t* (as in **bîn-t-u* 'daughter'). The variation between the two forms is explained usually by postulating originally different accentual conditions.³⁹ But other explanations have not been lacking, and a recent student regards it as probable that *-at* represents a combination of two distinct elements (*-a-* and *-t*), both intended to indicate the feminine.⁴⁰ The problem is clearly far from settled.

At this stage of our inquiry it will be well to eliminate from further consideration certain sources that are ordinarily likely to produce a specific feminine ending. We have seen that the personal pronoun cannot be held responsible in the present instance; its feminine element was *ī*. Nor does *-(a)t* owe its origin to some prominent designation of beings naturally female. In the earliest stages of Semitic such beings were signified not by the addition of special endings, but by individual stems.⁴¹ The employment of *-(a)t* to mark beings as female belongs to a later period, and the ending is thus obviously not original with the natural feminine. Later still must be its connection with the grammatical feminine.

The question of grammatical gender in Semitic, to restrict the problem to this specific case,⁴² has led to much speculation. The grammatical feminine is said to be due to the association of female animate beings with things which the primitive mind may consider female, and things inactive and inanimate. Together with abstracts, collectives, diminutives, and pejoratives, the entire group was viewed as inferior when contrasted with the active, male

³⁹ Brockelmann, *GVG* I. 405.

⁴⁰ Gray, *ISOL* 51 f.; cf. my review of this book in *Language* XI. 258.

⁴¹ Cf. Brockelmann, *op. cit.* 416.

⁴² For the same problem in Hamitic cf. the views of Meinhof, *Hamiten* 22 ff.; for the situation in Indo-European see Hirt, *Indogermanische Grammatik* III. 320 ff.

animates, and was consequently classed as feminine.⁴³ The ending $-(a)t$ would thus have spread to inanimates after it had become a mark of inferiority through association with passive, female animates.⁴⁴ Since designations for beings specifically female are not burdened with feminine endings in the earlier stages of Semitic, it has also been suggested that this implied higher rating may reflect a matriarchal organization of society.⁴⁵ With such sociological and, to a certain extent, metaphysical speculations we cannot be concerned at present. Generalizations about the workings of the primitive mind are out of place here, primarily because the linguistic data by which they have been inspired do not characterize a particularly early stage of primitive Semitic. We have seen that the ending $-(a)t$ is the product of a comparatively late, though still prehistoric period. Its introduction and subsequent wide distribution are relatively datable. To operate with concepts such as matriarchy is likely to involve us in anachronisms. And while the ending in question may have been specialized in course of time for names of weak or timid beings, diminutives, pejoratives, and the like, this function is but one of many; inferior classification will not account for the other usages. In short, too much mystery seems to be made of our feminine ending.⁴⁶

To return to our matter-of-fact inquiry, it will be best to review the larger groups that are typified by the ending $-(a)t$. Since these classes are well known and copiously illustrated in grammars, a minimum of examples will suffice. The categories to which they belong are the main thing.

1. The ending is used to form abstracts from adjectives, numerals, and verbs.

1a. **kull-* 'all': Akk. *kull-at-* 'totality'; Akk. *kēn-*

⁴³ So most recently Gray, *op. cit.* 48.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.* 51.

⁴⁵ Cf. Brockelmann, *GVG* I. 417.

⁴⁶ It should be stressed again that our present problem is not to analyze the Semitic feminine endings in general, but only the spread of the element $-(a)t$. It is altogether likely that early Semitic possessed originally a larger number of nominal categories than are found in the historical period. The wealth of such classes in Hamitic is justly suggestive, though in our ignorance of historical Hamitic grammar we cannot be sure what has been acquired from other African families.

'just': **kēn-t* 'justice'; Heb. *ra'* 'bad': **ra'-at* 'evil'; Arab. *ḥasan-* 'good': *ḥasanat-* 'goodness.'

1b. **ḥamiš-* 'five': **ḥamiš-at-* 'quintet.'

1c. **wtb* 'dwell': **tīb-t-* 'dwelling'; Akk. *nḅ* 'call': *nībī-t-* 'nomination, call': Heb. *qny* 'acquire': inf. **qanay-at*.

2. Participles yield collectives. Names of occupations, often specifically masculine, use collective forms for plurals, with secondary lengthening of the vowel of *-at*; this form is the same as the fem. pl. ending, a secondary specialization, as proved by its sing. case endings.⁴⁷

2a. **āriḥ-* > Heb. *ʾōrēḥ* 'wanderer, guest': **āriḥ-at-* 'caravan'; **bahim* 'dumb (?)': **bahim-at-* 'cattle, beasts'; Arab. *kafir-* 'unbeliever': coll. *kafar-at-* (with secondary shortening of the first vowel).

2b. Akk. *ḥazān-* 'governor': pl. *ḥazān-āt-*; *ikkar-* 'cultivator': pl. *ikkar-āt-*; Eth. *kāhen* 'priest': pl. *kāhen-āt*.

3. Conversely, collectives become *nomina unitatis*.

Heb. *šār* 'hair': **šār-at-* 'single hair'; Arab. *baqar-* 'cattle': *baqar-at-* 'single head of cattle'; with pl. endings, Heb. *lēḥēn-īm*⁴⁸ 'brick': **lēḥēn-at-* 'single brick'; Aram.⁴⁹ *se'ār-in* 'barley': *se'ār-t-ā* 'single grain.'

4. The ending is found in diminutives and related classes; cf. Heb. **yāniq-* 'sapling': **yāniq-at-* 'twig.'

Even from this schematic presentation it is apparent that the ending under discussion lent itself to a variety of uses. It should

⁴⁷ Cf. Brockelmann, *op. cit.* 441, and Gray, *ISOL* 52.

⁴⁸ The plural ending in such collectives is pleonastic and clearly secondary. Arabic did not feel the necessity of so marking its "broken plurals." In the dialect of Ras Shamra, however, the plural ending is present, but the fem. sing. is employed for the predicate; cf. e.g., *nḥl-m t-lk nḥl-m* 'the rivers flow (sing.) with honey,' Poem A iii, 13. Here too, then, we have proof that the collective "plural" was in function a fem. sing. Significant is also the fact that the pleonastic plural ending is masc. and not fem., plainly the heritage of a period in which special endings for the fem. pl. had not yet come into existence.

⁴⁹ Here and elsewhere in this discussion "Aram." is used for Syriac as well.

be emphasized, however, that the formation of abstracts is demonstrably its most prominent function, so much so that we may regard the class of abstract nouns as the one from which it was extended to other categories. Further analysis reveals two interesting facts. In the first place, the ending has at this stage of its progress no connection whatever with the feminine gender. It is used to form numerical substantives (**ḥamiš-at-*), which are employed subsequently with masculine nouns only ('a quintet of men'); when the dichotomy into two genders had at length won through, the original numeral (**ḥamiš-*) is assigned to the feminines.⁵⁰ The same independence of any definitely feminine connotation is seen in those names of occupations (cf. group 2b) that from their "plurals" with *-āt(i)*. And finally, this condition is echoed in such phrases as Akk. *nībīt Enlil anāku* 'I am the appointee of Enlil' (Hammurabi Code I. 52), which a thoroughly masculine ruler of Babylon applies to himself.

The other important fact about our ending is its remarkable versatility: it forms, among others, not only collectives but also their precise opposite, i. e., *nomina unitatis* (group 3). It is this seeming inconsistency that furnishes the necessary clue for the appreciation of the principal function of *-(a)t*. This was not to mark inferior classification, or to form abstracts, collectives, diminutives, or the like, but plainly to construct derivative stems with some special modification of the original meaning. To be sure, abstracts could thus be formed most readily, because of the underlying value of the formative, as will be shown later on; they were based on adjectives or verbs. But once the formative had gained prominence, it was the derivative signification that facilitated its expansion. The starting point was the decisive thing. Participles, agent nouns, and names of occupations formed collectives with the aid of *-(a)t*; but when the original form represented a collective (sometimes equipped with the plural ending), the derivative formation would signify a *nomen unitatis*. In other cases the ending could be used conveniently for diminutives and pejoratives. In other words, our formative became the simplest means of produc-

⁵⁰ This seems to me the simplest explanation of the curious behavior of the Semitic numerals for 'three' to 'ten.' Barth, *Pronominalbildung* 87, fails to see the connection between the *t*-endings of the numeral and noun because he regards the Eth. *tā*-suffix as original; it was borrowed, however, from the pronouns, cf. Bergsträsser, *Einführung* 98.

ing derivative nouns whose specialized meanings depended mainly on the primary values of the simple bases. In these circumstances, the influence of analogy must have been an important factor in the gradual development of distinct and schematized categories.

All this must have taken place before $-(a)t$ had acquired the function of a feminine ending, that is before it had come to designate female beings, thus leading to the emergence of the grammatical feminine. These advanced stages in the career of our formative are no longer difficult to follow. Its specializing connotation was before long found to be of value in modifying relationship terms. By the side of **'abu-* 'father,' **'aḥu-* 'brother' and **'bin-* 'child, son' there were formed **'abu + at-*, **'aḥu + at-*, and **'bin + at-*. The meaning of the new words would depend on the needs of the language. A word like **'abāt-* might come to signify 'fatherhood,' as an abstract, or 'parents' as a collective. In Heb. it is preserved in the sense of 'fathers.' Similarly, **'aḥāt-* and **'bin(a)t-* could yield abstracts or collectives. Now as collectives these words would refer simultaneously to males and females. If the corresponding simple plurals had been in vogue too long to be easily displaced, the new derivatives could be specialized for the females alone, yielding respectively 'sister' ⁵¹ and 'daughter.' ⁵²

It is impossible, of course, to determine the precise channel through which $-(a)t$ gained admittance to the group of names of animates. The above remarks are intended simply as a likely illustration. But what with the restrictive value of the element $-(a)t$ on the one hand, and the inconvenience of separate stems

⁵¹ Cf. e.g., the juxtaposition of German *Schwester* and *Ge-schwister*.

⁵² The t -form of **'abu-* could not displace the indispensable **'umm-* 'mother.' It is worthy of notice that while the latter word has the same meaning in all Semitic languages, **'bint-* is not the usual word for 'daughter' in Akk., and was specialized in another sense in the South Arabic group. Lastly, the explanation of the ending of Heb. *'aḥōt* ($< *'abāt$) as due to polarity with *nāšim* 'women' can now be given up without compunction; the contrast of 'fathers' and 'women' is hardly one of direct opposites. In *'aḥōt* we have simply an old collective in which the long vowel is due to the contraction of the vocalic termination of the base and the $-a$ of the ending. It is no more a real plural than *'aḥōt* 'sister,' where the quantity of the second vowel has precisely the same origin. As for the ending of *nāšim*, we have observed it in the capacity of a pleonastic element in collectives as early as Ras Shamra.

to designate beings respectively male and female on the other, the ultimate specialization of our ending as the feminine element was merely a matter of time. From here it is only a step to the grammatical feminine. Since the addition of $-(a)t$ to any given name of an animate being may introduce the female of the species, other words with the same ending will soon also be regarded as feminine. Analogy is here the main factor. This does not mean that in his progress towards grammatical gender the Semite was guided by no other principle. There are numerous words without special endings whose gender in historic times requires explanation. Our present task, however, has been to explain the origin of the grammatical feminines in $-(a)t$, and in this we need not look further than formal analogy.

Bearing in mind the fundamental function of the element $-(a)t$, viz., that of opposing secondary meanings to primary ones, we may postulate the following chronological stages in the progress of this ending.

1. Formation of abstracts from adjectives, numerals, and verbs.
2. Formation of collectives from participles and nouns.
3. Formation of derivatives in general, restricting in some way the value of the primary word (*nomina unitatis*, **ahāt*, **abāt*).
4. Designation of the natural feminine (**bin-(a)t* 'daughter').
5. Inclusion of all words ending in $-(a)t$ under the grammatical feminine; spread of the ending to the verb (masc. **qarib-a*: fem. **qarib-at*).
6. As a final link in this chain we may add the development of the feminine plural. On the analogy of the masculine (sing. $-u$: pl. $-ū$) the feminine formed a plural $-āt$ by the side of the singular $-at$.⁵³

It has been indicated that our ending owed its later prominence to its association with abstract nouns. The reason for this association is still to be investigated. We know that **kull-* 'all' becomes *kull-at-* 'totality,' and we may deduce from this the approximate force of the formative. But how did $-(a)t$ acquire that force? In other words, what is the origin of this element?

⁵³ For references see note 47.

Our search is necessarily limited to sources other than the noun and the verb. Moreover, there is no independent Semitic particle to which the ending under investigation could be related. There are, however, possible analogues among certain component elements.

Barth has established for Semitic the existence of an adverbial element occurring as *-ta* and *-t*: It is used with such words as Arab. *rubbata/t* 'occasionally,' Heb. *rabbat* 'greatly,' and Aram. *kēmat* 'namely,' and probably also Aram. *ʿeryat* 'in a state of nakedness.'⁵⁴ Perhaps Akk. *elīat* 'over and above' is to be included with this group. This suffix is generally identified with the feminine ending, but the derivation from the latter is justly rejected by Barth. If there is a connection between the two, borrowing from the adverbs would have to be assumed. Semantically, an adverbial element would not be out of place as a formative in abstract nouns.⁵⁵ But since this *-ta/t* is rare, obviously secondary, and obscure as to origin, we cannot attach to it much weight.

A much more tangible element is the *-t-* which appears as an accusative exponent in Akkadian to form independent pronominal forms indicating the direct object.⁵⁶ Thus *yā-t-i* means 'me,' and *kā-t-i* 'te.' The original full form of this element is not quite certain. It appears to require an initial *a-*,⁵⁷ and it is followed by *-i* or *-u*, both of which may be due, however, to the influence of the nominal declension. The composite form has to be given as *-(a)t(i/u)*, where *-t-* is at any rate invariable; its accusative function is equally constant. Akkadian is unique in its use of such independent pronominal forms, the other Semitic languages employing possessive affirmatives instead, without case exponents. But that these pronominal case endings (in addition to the accusative *-t-*, there is a dative *-š-*) are not Akkadian innovations, but

⁵⁴ *Pronominalendung* 87 ff.

⁵⁵ Cf. the use of Heb. *hinnām* 'gratis' (containing the common adverbial-accusative element **-am*) with a preceding noun in the construct state; e. g., *'ēd hinnām* 'witness of falsehood, false witness.' Conversely, abstract nouns may yield the sense of an adverb, as in Akk. *balṭussānu* 'their state of being alive,' i. e., 'they alive.'

⁵⁶ For this exceedingly important element, first noted by Bertin in 1885 (*JRAS* XVII. 65 ff.), see Barth, *Pronominalbildung* 25 ff.

⁵⁷ Note *šu-a-ti* 'him.'

rather survivals from the oldest period of Semitic, is proved by their occurrence in Hamitic. In the Agau group of the Cushitic branch we find the same element *-t* (in certain instances *-ti*) with precisely the same significance; cf. *yi-t* or *ye-t* 'me,' *ku-t* 'te.'⁵⁸ This complete correspondence between two widely separated linguistic divisions of Semitic and Hamitic respectively is one of the strongest arguments in favor of an underlying Hamito-Semitic stock.

This reference to Hamitic brings up an important point. Since an ultimate relationship between Hamitic and Semitic is now generally regarded as certain,⁵⁹ it follows that a morphological element prevalent in both families must go back to primitive Hamito-Semitic. The ending *-(a)t* is such an element; its origin must therefore be traceable to the proëthnic period. A given theory as to that origin will gain in plausibility if the assumed source is still represented in each of the two main subdivisions. In the light of these remarks the pronominal accusative element *-t* acquires added interest.

That case elements are capable of assuming wider formative functions is a fact too well known to need special emphasis. This is particularly true of the accusative because of the manifold uses of this case. A reference to Arabic syntax, e. g., will remind us of the existence of accusatives of comparison, of limitation or determination, of motive or cause, of state or condition, of time, place, salutation, adverbial accusatives, and so forth. The nominal accusative ending was frequently employed in Semitic to form independent adverbs.⁶⁰ As the direct object or "passive" case the accusative may lead to the formation of neuters, as seems to have occurred in Indo-European.⁶¹

⁵⁸ Cf. Barth, *ibid.*; Reinisch, *Das persönliche Fürwort und die Verbal-flexion in den chamito-semitischen Sprachen* 266 ff.

⁵⁹ For the latest discussion of this question see M. Cohen, "Les résultats acquis de la grammaire comparée chamito-sémitique," *Conférences de l'Institut de Linguistique de Paris*, 1933 (1934), 17 ff. For the question in general see Barton, *Semitic and Hamitic Origins*. Werner Vycichl, "Was sind Hamitensprachen?" *Africa* VIII. 76 ff., goes entirely too far for the present state of our knowledge.

⁶⁰ For the general question cf. Torczyner, *Die Entstehung des semitischen Sprachtypus*.

⁶¹ This view is rejected provisionally by Hirt, *Indogermanische Gram-*

There is, consequently, no semantic difficulty in deriving the Semito-Hamitic formative $-(a)t$ from a Semito-Hamitic accusative element $-t$. This ending may have been employed at first for adverbs, of which sporadic survivals⁶² have been mentioned above. No less probable is a direct borrowing by the noun for the purpose of forming abstracts, a use to which the case lends itself admirably; in fact, any one of several functions of this "adverbial" case might easily influence the transfer of its ending to the class of derivative nouns.⁶³

The contribution of Hamitic to our study is not exhausted by the aforementioned parallels. Other interesting possibilities are suggested by the behavior of the "feminine" ending under discussion. The Agau languages employ this element not only as an affix, but occasionally also as a prefix.⁶⁴ This reminds us that the $-t$, which acts as a pronominal accusative exponent in Akkadian, finds a wider application as an element in several prefixed *notae accusativi* of West Semitic; cf. Heb. *'et*, *'öt*, Aram. *yät*, and perhaps Phoen. *yt*.⁶⁵ The same juxtaposition in Hamitic of affix and prefix suggests also a closer parallel in the Semitic noun. There the origin of the prefix t - is yet to be explained. Its prin-

matik III. 95. The specific illustration for Semitic as chosen by Gray, *ISOL* 51 f., is incorrect; cf. *Language* XI. 258.

⁶² It is an interesting coincidence that von Soden, *ZA* 41. 119 f., seeks the origin of the Akk. adverbial ending $-š$ in the dative element $-š$ of the same pronominal class, which is related in turn to the $-s$ of the Agau languages. The formative possibilities of pronominal case elements are evidently beginning to be appreciated. If our theory is correct, the accompanying $-t$ of the accusative enjoyed an infinitely more varied career than the $-š/s$ of the dative, owing of course to the greater semantic flexibility of the accusative case.

⁶³ Torczyner, who has perhaps overemphasized the significance of the accusative, derives the feminine ending from an entirely precarious $-tam$; cf. *Enst. d. sem. Sprachtypus* 259 ff.

⁶⁴ Cf. Reinisch, *op. cit.* (note 58) 278. This procedure is known also from the Berber languages.

⁶⁵ Cf. Barth, *Pronominalbildung* 95, where the connection with the accusative $-t$ is, however, not recognized. Gray's (*ISOL* 56) proposed etymology for Heb. *'öt* is far-fetched; moreover, Akk. *yät* (*ibid.*) has nothing to do with accusative particles, being an independent oblique case of the pronoun of the first person. The Heb. *notae accusativi* are compared with the Hamitic t -elements by Meinhof, *Hamiten* 24, note 1, and 227, note 2. Though he confuses the two particles of Hebrew, he was clearly on the right track.

cial function is the formation of abstract nouns from verbs. When it is realized that this is also one of the most important uses of the ending $-(a)t$, the ability of Hamitic to use this formative at the beginning or at the end of certain bases assumes an unexpected significance. It should be borne in mind that Semitic can form verbal nouns with $-(a)t$ ($*tīb-(a)t$, *qatal-at*), as well as with t - (*ta-qtil*); there is scarcely any difference in meaning between Heb. **neḥam-at* and *ta-nḥūm* 'comforting.' We do not know enough about primitive Semitic to determine the laws which governed the distribution of prefixes and affixes respectively. We are entirely in the dark as to why the accusative $-t$ was affixed in Akkadian while the *notae accusativi* were prefixed in Semitic nor why the definite articles occur proclitically in Hebrew or Arabic and enclitically in Aramaic. But the underlying correspondence in meaning, and the Hamitic analogues, make it difficult to dissociate $-(a)t$ from t -. It goes without saying that the further development of the formative in these two positions did not proceed along strictly parallel lines; in course of time the prefix and affix can even be used pleonastically.⁶⁶

Having reached this concluding stage of our investigation, we are in a better position to inquire about the original form of the ending; was it $-t$ or $-at$? The evidence of Hamitic, which in our present state of knowledge of Hamitic phonology need not be regarded as conclusive, would favor $-t$. In Semitic a preceding a - is found in most positions, but the vowel may be heterogeneous. A clear-cut decision in the matter is therefore impossible for the present.

Finally, the question may be raised anew as to the origin of the t -stem in the verb. So long as t -nouns were considered an isolated class, the connection of their characteristic element with that of the reciprocal conjugation was viewed as impossible: the disparity in meaning was much too wide.⁶⁷ The matter is placed in a different light now that the formatives t - and $-(a)t$ may both be derived from an old accusative ending. For a semantic relationship between accusative and reciprocal elements is not beyond

⁶⁶ That is, nouns with the preformative t - may have also the feminine ending $-(a)t$.

⁶⁷ Cf. Brockelmann, *GVG* I. 383.

the realm of probability. But this is as far as we can afford to go. There are other possibilities worthy of consideration, if one cares to indulge in speculations of this kind. Short of some such striking indication as was provided by the correspondence of sibilants and laryngals in the causative conjugation and in the personal pronoun of the third person, there can be no assurance that we are on the right track.*



* [The circumstance of an incomplete page gives me the opportunity to make a few additions. I note that in his *Kitāb Ugarit* ('The Ugarit Texts'), Jerusalem, 1936, H. L. Ginsberg still maintains that the dialect of Ras Shamra (see above, note 17) recognized only *š*-causatives. This view leads him to forced interpretations of obviously causative forms as simple qals. There is ample evidence against it, but this is not the place to register more fully this objection to an otherwise admirable work. Another recent publication is Meinhof's *Die Entstehung flektierender Sprachen*, Berlin, 1936, with a chapter devoted to a fresh formulation of the author's views on the grammatical gender (pp. 63-76). On the general problem of the pronouns of the first and second person attention may be called to the note by F. R. Blake in *Amer. Jour. of Philol.* 55. 244-48.

Finally, I wish to stress again the fact that for reasons of economy and convenience most of the examples cited in this article are of the stock variety favored in modern grammars. Much of the illustrative material collected for this study has had to be omitted. It may be relevant, however, to cite two instances of the privative use of the causative stem: Heb. *hōriš* (: **wrš*) 'disinherit' (by the side of 'cause to inherit') and Mishnic Heb. *hāb/pqēr* 'forfeit' : Akk. *b/paqāru* 'claim legally, vindicare.')

THE LEMON IN INDIA

HELEN M. JOHNSON

OSCEOLA, MISSOURI

IN THE article "The Lemon in China and Elsewhere"¹ the late Dr. Laufer started with two assumptions: that the lemon is among the "fruits we owe to India"; and that "the word type 'lemon' is of Indic origin." Both of these assumptions are contrary to the generally expressed theories of botanists and philologists; and Dr. Laufer gave no evidence in favor of them. The one botanist, Sir George Watt, whom he quotes to support his views, is misquoted (see below); his statements are the opposite of those attributed to him by Dr. Laufer. The reason, perhaps, for this misquotation is that throughout his article Dr. Laufer apparently uses the word "lemon" for *Citrus medica*, var. *acida* (Watt), which is the sour or common lime of India. That is, he transfers the Sanskrit and vernacular names of the lime to the lemon. Early travelers to India and popular writers used "lemon" indiscriminately for various kinds of citrus fruits, and current Anglo-Indian speech often uses "lemon" for the lime. During a residence of six years in India, I did not see a lemon, though I, in common with other English-speaking persons, bought limes and limeade under the name of lemons and lemonade.² But presumably when Dr. Laufer says "lemon" he means the lemon. Indeed, he refers to the scientific name, *Citrus limonia*, Osbeck, adopted by Dr. Swingle for the lemon.

Whether or not the lemon and lime should be distinguished as separate species, as modern botanists do,³ it is a certainty that the Sanskrit and vernacular names and information about Watt's lime can not be transferred to *Citrus limonia*, Osbeck. Without attempt-

¹ JAOS. 54, pp. 143 ff.

² Dr. Laufer himself, p. 144, refers to a statement that "lemon-juice" is applied to "lime-juice" also in China.

³ Dr. Swingle replied to my inquiry: "As I understand it, the lemon was not at all well known in India until relatively recent times. I am myself rather inclined to think that Watt is right in supposing the lemon to come from Arabia, but we have as yet no evidence to prove this theory. I have considered the lime to be a separate species from the lemon. Apparently the name for the lime is *Citrus aurantifolia* (Christm.) Swingle, whereas the proper name for the lemon is *Citrus limonia*, Osbeck."

ing to settle the native country of the lemon or to distinguish the numerous varieties of the Citrus, which is a difficult problem for citrus experts, it seems advisable to point out some errors arising from this failure to distinguish between the lime and lemon.

On page 156 Dr. Laufer says: "According to G. Watt (*The Commercial Products of India*, 1908, p. 325), who calls the lemon *Citrus medica*, var. *acida*, it is 'undoubtedly a native of India.'" Let us go directly to Watt. He says: "It may be said that while the orange is indigenous to China, and the lime to India, the citron originated very possibly in Persia and Media, while the lemon is so closely associated with the Arabs as to suggest its having come from Arabia."⁴ (Italics mine.) These four and the pomelo, he says, are the five species of the Citrus family cultivated in India at the present time. The pomelo was not introduced into India until the seventeenth century, and it and the orange may be omitted from the present discussion. Watt makes the citron proper, the lemon, the sour and sweet limes, all varieties of *Citrus medica*, citron. So does Brandis,⁵ and so does Dutt, who alone uses "lemon juice" for the juice of the sour lime.⁶ Shyam Sundar Das's *Hindī Śabdasāgara*⁷ follows this in general, though it is not concerned with European botanical names, but classifies the species of the *nībū* according to Sanskrit authorities. Watt's classification of the forms of *Citrus Medica* is as follows:⁸

1. Var. *medica* proper. The Citron, Adam's Apple, etc. Its common Sanskrit names are *mātulūṅga* (°*lūṅga*) and *bijapura*, and its most usual name in Hindī is *bijaurā nībū*. (The *Śabdasāgara* gives *mātulūṅga* and *bjaka* as synonyms.)

I quote Watt verbatim on the lemon and sour lime. The sweet lime, Var. *Limetta*, does not concern us.

2. Var. *Limonum* or Lemon. The word lemon comes from the Arabic *limūn*, and through the Persian became the Hindī *limu*, *limbu* or *nimbu*. It is specifically known to the Indian people as the *pahari* (hill) *nimbu*, *karna* (or *korna*) *nebu*, *kintī*, *meta-limbu*, *thora-limbu*, and as the *kalambak* of Arabic and the *kalīnbak* of Persian.

⁴ *Commercial Products of India*, p. 319.

⁵ *Indian Trees*.

⁶ *Materia Medica of the Hindus*.

⁷ A Dictionary of modern Hindī (Benares: Nagari Pracarini Sabha, 1914-29). It has a most excellent article on the *nībū*, Citrus.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 325.

The wild form of the lemon has not been recorded as met with in India—the plant mentioned by Royle, Madden, and others was more probably the lime than the lemon. Lemons are, however, fairly extensively cultivated here and there all over India. Still, the true lemon is hardly one of the regularly grown fruits in the gardens of the people generally, but rather of the well-to-do and curious.

3. Var. *acida*; Kew Bull., 1894, 113-6. 177-82 and pl.; the Sour Lime of India. This is the lemon of most popular writers, and is undoubtedly a native of India. It is the true *nibu* or *nebu*, *nimbu*, *libu*, etc., and is the *jambiri* of Baber, the *jambira*, *limpāka*, *nimbuka*, *viyapura* and *viyaka*⁹ (according to Dutt) of the Sanskrit authors (Susruta (ed. Kessler), 1844, i., 86). This is the plant usually met with in a wild state in the warm valleys of the Himalaya. (He then describes several of its cultivated forms.)

This paragraph is presumably the source of Dr. Laufer's statement (p. 157) that the lemon is contained in the work of Suśruta, according to Watt. But while he appropriates for the lemon this perfectly correct statement about the lime, he says (p. 158) that if it is true that the lemon is mentioned in the Nabatean Agriculture, dated A. D. 903, "it would be the earliest reference to the fruit in the literatures of the world." I do not know how these two statements are to be reconciled. *Jambira*, according to Watt, Dutt, and the Indian lexicographers, is the *C. medica*, var. *acida* of Watt, but Dr. Laufer objects¹⁰ to its being called lemon (which would be correct in his own terminology): "it denotes not the lemon, but *Citrus medica*." I suppose the authority for that is the Petersburg's *Citronenbaum*.

Dr. Laufer thinks, certainly correctly, that Sanskrit *nimbū* and *nimbūka* are probably based on vernacular forms; but he considers the vernacular words indigenous to India, whereas others consider that the Indian words come from the Arabic. I have already quoted Watt's opinion, and the *Śabdasaṅgraha* takes the same view. *Nimbū* does not occur in early works. The *Rājaniḥaṇṭu* and *Bhāvaprakāśa*, to which Dr. Laufer refers,¹¹ are ascribed to the

⁹ I am inclined to doubt that *bijapura* and *bijaka* ever refer to the lime. The *Śabdasaṅgraha* gives them only as "citron," which is their meaning in Sanskrit. They are decidedly literary Hindi, and are not quoted in the ordinary vernacular lexicons. *Bijapura* is in Suśruta, but refers to the Citron. *Jambira* is also in Suśruta, and is Watt's lime, not the *Citrus limonia*.

¹⁰ Note 16.

¹¹ P. 157.

thirteenth and sixteenth centuries respectively. *Nimbūkaphala-pānaka* is cited from the *Bhāvaprakāśa*.

Nimbū, or *nībū*,¹² is a generic name for citrus fruits, but used alone it means the lime, both in actual practice and lexically. Other kinds of citrus are *nībū* with qualifiers. If Watt is correct in identifying the *karna nebu* with the real lemon, the first Indian author who refers to the lemon, so far as I can ascertain, is Hemacandra. His *Abhidhānacintāmaṇi* enumerates all kinds of vegetation, and should be consulted on such a question. *Nimbū* and kindred words do not occur, but he enumerates four kinds of citrus:¹³ *karuṇa* or *mallikāpuṣpa*; *jambīra*, *jambha*, *jambhala*, the lime; *mātulinga*, *bijapura*, the citron; *nāgarāṅga*, *nārāṅga*, the orange. The lexicons and Boehtlingk and Roth called *karuṇa* *Citrus decumana*, but that is impossible, as pointed out above, because of the late introduction of *C. decumana*, the pomelo, into India. This *karuṇa* is Watt's *karna nebu* and the *Śabdasāgara* also identifies it with the lemon, apparently, though it is impossible to be certain from the description. However, it says it is the *pahārī nībū* and *kalambaka* in Arabic. Dutt speaks of the different opinions in regard to the *karuṇa*. "Wilson in his Sanskrit dictionary calls it *Citrus decumana*. In the *Hortus Bengalensis* it is translated into *Citrus medica*, while Drury and other Madras authorities make the variety *Citrus Limonum*. The *Śabdakalpadruma*¹⁴ does not give any synonym or vernacular term for it, so that it is difficult to say, what form it really meant. In the vernacular the term *karunā* is applied to a variety of *Citrus medica*."

In view of the very late date of the occurrence of the word *nimbū*, it is difficult to believe that it had an indigenous origin. On the other hand, why did a foreign word supplant native ones both as a generic term and specific name for an indigenous fruit? But if the lemon is a native of India, surely it would be mentioned in Sanskrit works before the twelfth century, the date of the *Abhidhānacintāmaṇi*. It is quite possible that the *limūnah* of the Arabic geographers,¹⁵ a fruit in Sind as large as an apple and very sour, was a large lime or citron.

¹² See the article in the *Śabdasāgara*, s. v. *nībū*.

¹³ 4. 215-16, 209.

¹⁴ A modern encyclopedia.

¹⁵ P. 158.

MODEL EMPERORS OF THE GOLDEN AGE IN CHINESE LORE

JEAN GATES

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

CHINESE literature is filled with the idea of an ancient golden age, when it is claimed there was a united empire almost as large as China at the greatest expansion under the Chou dynasty. This empire was ruled by sages and contained the norm and pattern for all future ages. The conception resembles the Messianic hope of the Jews, save that the Chinese looked to an idealized past while the Jews thought of the future. The heroes of this golden age are the three sage emperors, Yao 堯, Shun 舜, and Yü 禹, who according to Chinese tradition lived from 2356 to 2177 B. C.¹ The term "model emperor lore" as applied to the ideals and philosophy connected with these three emperors was used by the German sinologue, Friedrich Hirth, in his historical account of ancient China published in 1908.²

These sage emperors are models embodying deep-seated racial ideals which contribute to the Chinese world view and have had a stupendous influence on all subsequent life and thought. These ideals are blended under two inclusive theories known as *te-hua* *hsüeh shuo* 德化學說 meaning "transformation by virtue," and *shang-jang* 擅讓 meaning "to cede" or "to yield." Briefly, these ideals were exemplified by emperors who ruled, not by force, but by the diffusion of a personal virtue, and who resigned their thrones to those they claimed were more worthy than themselves. The throne to the worthiest was the ideal of the golden age. Under these theories are found such ideals as self-criticism, non-assertion, and pacifism. One of the emperors, Shun, became a model of filial piety. By relegating the golden age to antiquity, the Chinese gave the sanction of antiquity to their highest ideals, and this sanction has continued valid until recent times. Furthermore, the

¹ Legge, *Chinese Classics*, vol. 3, pp. 15 ff. The first records of their achievements are found in six books of the 書經 *Shu-ching*; the 堯典 Yao-tien, 舜典 Shun-tien, 大禹謨 Ta Yü mo, 益稷 I-chi, 禹貢 Yü-kung, and the 洪範 Hung-fan.

² Hirth, F., *Ancient History of China*, p. 33.

model emperors exemplify democratic and socialistic tendencies in government, and give a prominent place to sage ministers.

The theories and ideals mentioned above are developed and expanded in the writings of the Great Philosophical Period, the 6th to the 3rd century B. C.³ They belong largely to the Confucian school; nevertheless some of the ideals are shared by rival schools of thought. The lore had a severe struggle for existence, threatened as it was by the anti-cultural ideals of the Taoists, those of absolute law of the Legalists, the Universal Love of Mo-ti, and the Hedonism of Yang-chu. In spite of the prescription of the Classics by Ch'ien Shih-huang-ti and the burning of the books, the world-view as contained in the lore finally triumphed with the recovery of the Confucian classics and the fixing of the canon under Wu Ti 武帝 (140-86 B. C.) of the Han Dynasty, and became the official guide for government and all subsequent philosophical thought. It also had a profound effect on the writing of history, all later works being written with the purpose of social and moral control. It also set an example for invoking the sanction of antiquity, and pushing back antiquity to other traditional figures as carriers of new social ideals and theories.⁴ History written under the influence of these ideals does not necessarily give a true picture of the period it deals with, but it preserves other valuable and worth-while elements, and portrays the thought of the period in which it was written. The traditional view of the *Shu-ching* is that it was compiled by Confucius from older existing documents, that all its statements are true, that a golden age was realized in antiquity in which a large united empire was ruled over by sage kings, that this was the most enlightened period of Chinese history, and that its sanctions are of permanent value.⁵ In this study an attempt will be made to show the traditional background out of which the model emperors and the theories of the lore were evolved, as well as the position of modern Chinese and Western scholars concerning the status of the lore.

³ For discussion of these theories, as developed in the different schools of thought, and their influence on the government of China, and the writing of history see: M. Jean Gates, *The Model Emperor Lore*, Master's thesis, Columbia University, 1932.

⁴ Ku Chieh-kang 顧頡剛, 五德終始說下的政治和歷史, "Government and History under the Cycle of the Five Elements," *Tsinghua Journal*, 1930.

⁵ Karlgren, B., *Philology in Ancient China*, p. 101 ff.

The conclusion of the discussion will deal with an explanation of the background and conditions which gave rise to this rationalized account of ancient traditional material.

The Traditions and Personalities in the Model-Emperor Lore

In the first place the records dealing with the model emperors do not deal with contemporary figures, for the first four sections of the *Classic of History* begin with the words: "Examining into antiquity we find that the Emperor . . . was" etc.⁶ It cannot be proved that the emperors were not real figures, but the evidence thus far available casts doubt on the assumption. The earliest contemporary records of China, the oracle bones of the Yin or Shang dynasty (1766-112 B. C.), which followed directly the dynasties attributed to the model emperors, do not mention them. Yü, the latest chronologically of these emperors, appears in the earliest Chinese literature, the *Odes* of the western Chou period (c. 1122-770 B. C.). There are six references to him in this work, in which he appears in the rôle of a divinity who set in order the hills and rivers, and divided the land after the deluge.⁷ Save for the first few chapters dealing with the model emperors—and these written hundreds of years after the events recorded therein are claimed to have occurred—the *Shu-ching* has only a few passages relating to these sages. Yü's name seems arbitrarily attached to a book of geography, the *Yü Kung*, which forms the first book of those attributed to the Hsia period (2205-1766). In this work his divine rôle of the *Odes* as divider of the land is interpreted as that of surveyor of the empire, in which rôle he defined its natural features as well as the boundaries of its provinces and their products, as they existed at the greatest expansion of the Chou dynasty. This book as it now stands is supposed to have been a product of the same period as that which gave rise to the model-emperor lore. There is only one other reference to Yü in the books supposed to belong to this era, and that is in the *Songs of the Five Sons*, a work whose genuineness is disputed.⁸ He is mentioned once in the books ascribed to the Shang period (1766-1122 B. C.). In the *Hung Fan* or *Great Plan*, ascribed to the Chou period, a legend of Yü seems

⁶ Legge, *Shu-ching*, vol. 3, pp. 15, 29, 52.

⁷ Legge, *Shih-ching*, vol. 4, pp. 373, 462, 546, 622, 638, 645.

⁸ Legge, *Shu-ching*, vol. 3, pp. 92, 157.

to have been reworked so as to make him the founder of the earliest system of Chinese philosophy.⁹ In the *Analects of Confucius*, now dated by Ku Chieh-kang as earlier than the first few chapters of the *Shu-ching*, Yü is a very human figure. Stripped of all legendary lore, he embodies the Confucian ideal by living frugally but observing with elegance the rites, and he is said to have "expended all his strength on the ditches and water channels."¹⁰ The titanic work attributed to him of controlling the deluge here shrinks to the more human proportions of irrigation work carried out by the early ancestors of the Chinese. Ku Chieh-kang points out four stages through which he believes the Yü lore to have passed, in which a divinity, God of the hills and streams, finally becomes one of the model emperors—an exponent of the Confucian ideal of kingly government.¹¹

As to Yao and Shun, very little is known of them until the Spring and Autumn Period (722-481 B. C.). The *Odes* do not mention them. There is one reference, supposedly to Yao, in the *Song of the Five Sons*, but, as has been mentioned, the authenticity of this work is doubtful. Here he is referred to as a prince of a small territory.¹² There is one brief mention of these emperors in the books attributed to the Shang period where they appear as models of kingship.¹³ In one of the books ascribed to the Chou period the small number of their ministers is compared to that of the Chou, while in the *Analects* Yao and Shun are mentioned three times and described in the same phraseology as in the first few chapters of the *Shu-ching*.¹⁴

It is evident how very meagre these earliest references are. In the lore as found in the *Shu-ching*, fragments of traditions are found interspersed among long discourses embodying social and political ideals. Yü in one of his admonitory speeches to the emperor Shun tells of his superhuman work in draining off the waters of the deluge "which embraced the mountains and overtopped the hills."¹⁵ The administration of Yao, according to

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 92.

¹⁰ Legge, *Analects*, vol. I, p. 215.

¹¹ Hummel, A., *Autobiography of a Chinese Historian*, p. 96.

¹² Legge, *Shu-ching*, vol. 3, p. 159.

¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 262.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 525; *Analects*, vol. I, pp. 214, 261, 350.

¹⁵ Legge, *Shu-ching*, vol. 3, p. 24.

Maspero, is based partly on an ancient sun myth. Ancient ideas of divine kingship are also present. The story of Shun is often cited as being based on the plot of a folk-tale, where the persecuted son of an unprincipled father and stepmother triumphs by means of his virtue over all his difficulties and marries the daughters of the king. There seems also to be reminiscence of ordeal. Yao first tests Shun by marriage to his daughters. He seems to have stood this test and yet another, for it said: "Being sent to the great plain at the foot of the mountains, amid violent wind, thunder and rain, he did not go astray."¹⁶ These tales stripped of all but the framework of myth and folktale are elaborated in later works. In the writings of Mencius, who lived about one hundred years later than Confucius, the narrative is greatly enlarged. It is interesting to note that he connects the model emperors with a period "when the world had not yet been perfectly reduced to order," and "the vast waters flowing out of their channels made a universal inundation," a time when vegetation was rank, dragons abounded, and birds and beasts swarmed and were a menace to men.¹⁷ There is one significant addition to the Yü traditions found in the *Shih Chi*, of Ssü-ma Ch'ien of the Han dynasty (206 B. C.-220 A. D.). Here Yü is connected with the south of China. He is said to have died and been buried at a mountain called K'uai-chi, 會稽, near the present Shaohsing in the province of Chekiang—then the barbarian territory of Yüeh; his purpose in going there having been to reunite the lords south of the river and to appraise their merits.¹⁸ Tales in the *Tso Chuan* and *Kuo Yü* also give more detail and depart from the classical accounts in the *Shu-ching* and the philosophical interpretation given by the early classical writers. Besides these accounts, there are in such books of the third and fourth centuries B. C. as the *Shan Hai Ching* 山海經 or *Mountain and Sea Classic*—a book of geography with fantastic tales of strange lands and peoples—and in the *T'ien Wên* 天問 one of the poems of the *Elegies of Ch'u*, (楚詞 Ch'u-tzū) tales of the model emperors with all the imaginative accessories of folklore and myth.

We have thus the phenomenon of a traditional figure, Yü, described first in the earliest Chinese literature, the *Odes*, in terms

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 32.

¹⁷ Legge, *Mencius*, vol. 2, p. 250.

¹⁸ Chavannes, *Les Memoires Historiques de Se-ma Ts'ien*, vol. I, pp. 162, 171.

of a god, becoming, in the classical accounts of the *Shu-ching*, a human emperor along with Yao and Shun who are supposed to have preceded him, but who first make their appearance in literature several hundred years after him. These figures in the hands of philosophers are made to exemplify the Confucian ideal, and have had a profound influence on Chinese life and thought. As time went on, the meager accounts in the *Shu-ching* were enlarged both in philosophical and in imaginative and mythological writings. Tsui Shu, 崔述 a critical scholar of the eighteenth century, was the first to point out "that the model-emperor lore was built up in successive strata, so that the more remote the event, the more detailed becomes the information about that event." He also pointed out "that writers of antiquity made a practice of substantiating their theories by illustrations from folk-lore," and "that after long transmission those illustrations, together with accretions and mistaken interpretations were accepted as fact, thereby vitiating many histories, commentaries, and philosophical writings that appeared after the time of the Warring Kingdoms."¹⁹ (403-253 B. C.)

Many Chinese scholars believe the model emperors to have been all they are represented to be in the early chapters of the *Shu-ching* and in later literature, and that the Classics are infallible. K'ang Yu-wei, a scholar and reformer of the late Manchu and early revolutionary period, was the first to admit that Confucius, with a view to social reform, read his ideas back into a past that had no basis in fact.²⁰ Ku Chieh-kang believes that Yü was a god of the hills and streams in the western Chou period, that he was later humanized and arbitrarily attached to the traditional figures, Yao and Shun, in the fourth century B. C., and that the so-called Golden Age, with China one united kingdom, was in reality a time when only a clan concept prevailed.²¹

Among Western scholars, James Legge, one of the earliest sinologists, believed that Yü was an historical personage and founder of the Chinese empire, that Yao and Shun were also real men, chiefs of the earliest Chinese immigrants, but that they must be

¹⁹ Hummel, A., *Autobiography of a Chinese Historian*, Introduction, p. xxxvii.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, p. xiv; see also K'ang Yu-wei, 康有爲, 孔子改制考 *K'ung-tzu kai-chih k'ao*.

²¹ Ku Chieh-kang, 古史辨 *Ku-shih pien*, vol. 1, pp. 106 ff.

divested of all the grandeur of the accounts in the *Shu-ching*, which are obviously legendary.²² Chavannes believed that the model emperors were "ces trois augustes fantômes mythologiques," that the work ascribed to Yü would demand the labors of several continuous generations, and that a thousand details in their history reveal the much later customs and political organization of the Chou dynasty.²³ Maspero characterizes the accounts of the origin of Chinese civilization, their first dynasties and emperors, as euhemeristic interpretations, pseudo-historic, drawn from uncritical writings and religious legends. He says that under the pretext of finding the historical nucleus, they have eliminated the marvellous elements which seem to them unreasonable, and have conserved the residue where gods and heroes are transformed into saintly emperors and sage ministers. He says these legends are sometimes myths, sometimes legends arising from the ancestral temples of great families and local religious centers, sometimes songs accompanying dances used in great ceremonies to royal ancestors, sometimes in part at least scholarly explanations to elaborate and explain a rite. He connects Yü with some communal legends of the peoples of ancient China related to draining off the waters of the earth and the appropriation of the land for cultivation. Because so little was known about Yao and Shun (Shun had a legend, Yao had none) he says that these two emperors were made the saints par excellence in whom were incarnated all the virtue which the philosophy of the Chou attributed to a saint, and they were claimed as the first ancestors of the great families of the court of Chou.²⁴

Granet believes that although the recitals of Yü the Great are purely mythical, this does not prove him not to have been an historical personage; and he asserts that although details of the history relating to this early period cannot be accepted as historical fact, yet there is no reason to doubt the reality of its existence. Granet is an adherent of the school of sociology headed by Emil Durkheim, and true to its tenets goes back to the most ancient forms of social practice to explain categories of thought. Thus the social and political ideals of which the model emperors are the exponents preserve a memory of ancient and even archaic customs

²² Legge, *Shu-ching*, Prolegomena, p. 80.

²³ Chavannes, *op. cit.*, Introduction, p. cxli.

²⁴ Maspero, H., *La Chine Antique*, chap. 1, and "Legendes Mythologiques dans le Chou King," *Journal Asiatique*, 1924, pp. 1-100.

and manners. For instance, the practice by the model emperors of that great virtue and ideal of the Chinese known as "jang" is said to preserve a memory of palavers between two conflicting geniuses in an ancient form of society in which one tries to gain the precedence over the other while seeming to relinquish it. He states that the legends of Chinese tradition inform us of an epoch when the sovereign and his minister, representing heaven and earth, alternated in authority. When the minister had reached a certain age he could replace the sovereign if he issued victorious from certain tests, such as exposure in the brushwood or marriage with the daughters of the sovereign, as is recorded of Shun. In this case the minister could oblige the sovereign to cede the authority (*jang*) to him, and could compel him to leave the kingdom. It is interesting to note that all these sovereigns died outside the royal domain in barbarian territory. Granet points out that *jang* is the name of a ceremony used to expel the Old Year and install the New, and signifies to banish as well as to renounce. The ceremonies of accession are said to have been accompanied by dancing matches, in which the defeated chieftan pays for his defeat with death or banishment. Kun, minister to Yao, and father of Yü, wished to make his sovereign resign his authority to him, but failed in the required tests, and paid for it with his life. These legends are also said to preserve a memory of a time when the authority was transmitted from grandfather to grandson in the agnatic line. The records reveal that Kun was the son of a sovereign, and that he and Tan-chu, son of Yao, were thereby both debarred from power. Kun was sacrificed, and Tan-chu either met this fate or was banished. Yü is said to mark the transition to direct succession of father to son, and in this case the minister is the one who is banished.²⁵ This gives a brief résumé of some of the opinions of Chinese and European scholars as to the status of the model emperors and their traditions.

As to the specific myths or legends connected with the model emperors, the oldest one from a literary standpoint is connected with Yü and a deluge. If one accepts Ku Chieh-kang's dating of the *Analects* as coming before the *Shu ching*, the evolution of the classical version of the Yü tradition is as follows: He is first revealed in the *Odes* as a divinity who drained off a deluge, and his

²⁵ Granet, *Chinese Civilization*, pp. 59, 206-225; chap. 5.

name is also connected with Hou Chi 后稷, (literally Prince Millet), the ancestor of the Chou clans. The latter (who is said to have been conceived through his mother stepping on the footprint of God),²⁶ is described as continuing the work of Yü.²⁷ In the *Analects* Yü is an early king who spent his strength on irrigation work. The *Shu-ching* shows him grown in splendor and exemplifying all the kingly virtues mentioned in the early part of this study. The deluge which he drained off is said to have overtopped the hills, and he opened passages for the streams and deepened the canals. In this story, Yü succeeded his father, Kun, minister of works, who had been unsuccessful in coping with the flood. Mencius, one of the latest classical writers of this period to deal with Yü and the deluge, connects it with an inundation in a period of chaos at the origin of the world.

In the *Shan Hai Ching* there is a different version. The Lord on high, Shang Ti 上帝 charges Yü to put the earth in order and establish the nine provinces. He vanquishes the clouds and rain in their mountain fastnesses. It is said that he did not try to dike the water but drained it off. During his great work he was metamorphosed at times into a bear. His wife seeing him one day in this form, fell down from fear and was turned into stone. She was pregnant with Ch'í and the stone continued to grow. It was finally opened by Yü with a sword and his son was removed. *Huai-nan-tz'ü* has a different rendering of the story. In antiquity the breach called the Dragon Gate, *Lung Mên*, through which the Yellow river flows, was not yet open and the waters embraced the mountains. Kun, counselled by a tortoise and a sparrow hawk, made dikes, but the water mounted and threatened the domain of the Lord on high. He thereupon ordered Kun to be executed. The body remained exposed three years without decomposing, then was opened with one blow of a sword and Yü came out. Kun transformed himself into a fish and threw himself into the Yellow river. Then Shang-ti charged Yü to put in order the earth and establish the nine provinces. Yü pierced a breach in the mountain at *Lung Mên*, and the waters flowed out.²⁸ The Lord on high then caused Hou

²⁶ Karlgren, B., "Some Fecundity Symbols in Ancient China," *The Museum of Far Eastern Antiquities*, Bulletin No. 2, p. 53 ff.

²⁷ Legge, vol. 4, p. 622.

²⁸ Geologically speaking, the Huang Ho has since time immemorial passed through *Lung Mên*, according to Professor George Barbour, who surveyed the area from Kansu to Honan.

Chi to be miraculously born and he taught men to cultivate the millet. Yü and Hou Chi became the ancestors of the Lords of men.

Maspero discusses four other legends all built on this theme, connected with different geographical areas. They are T'ai T'ai 臺駘 in the northwest, Kung Kung 共工 and Ch'ih-Yu 蚩尤 in the south, and Nu Wa 女媧 (女娃, 女希) in the great plain. The general theme represents the earth covered with water and the Lord on high sends one of his celestial subjects to regulate it. He fails but the second one sent is successful, and after having made the world habitable, becomes in recompense ancestor of the Lords of the country. The Lord on high sends to earth all that is necessary for agriculture, sometimes by the same hero and sometimes by another, and men begin to cultivate the soil. This theme, says Maspero, is common to all the peoples of Southeastern Asia, and similar legends are found among the T'ai Blanc of North Annam. It is not a creation story proper, as the earth is accepted as having always existed, but in the beginning it was believed to have been covered with water, and these legends deal with the regulation of the water, and the peopling of the earth. The Nu Wa story is the only one among the Chinese which preserves the story of the creation of man.

In the opinion of Maspero, all these Chinese legends are local legends adapted to a general communal theme, and the legend of Yü is a local legend of the opening of the pass at Lung Mên and an ancient overflowing of the Yellow River. Yü's name and that of his father, Kun, are attached to all the celebrated sites in this region. There is a false breach in the mountain which is attributed to Kun. The great ford of the Yellow River near Lung Mên is called today the ford of Yü, Yü-mên tao, and is said to have been known by this name in the sixth century. The cult of Yü has its center here, and there is a temple to him. In the sixth century Li Tao-yüan saw near the temple a stele which was much effaced and dated from 227. Kun was a God of the Yellow River where it enters Honan, and his transformation into a fish is localized in two places. Yü and Kun were also claimed as ancestors of the clan Ssü which had two seats—one near Lung Mên and the other in Honan. T'ai T'ai, who was connected with the regulation of the river Fên was also god of this river and of a cult which had a temple here, and was claimed as ancestor of clans in the vicinity.

Ch'ih Yu was a divinity with a cult and was the lord of armies. Kung Kung had no cult but was the father of several divinities.

Maspero and Ku Chieh-kang agree that the tale of Yü is an example of euhemerism, but they differ as to the origin of the tale. Maspero, as has been stated, connected Yü with Lung Mên, the ancient seat of the Chinese, and explains the connection with the south as due to a practice of barbarian peoples on the borders of China who sometimes claimed kinship with her heroes, thus making legitimate their claim to rule, and to be an integral part of the empire. He says that the barbarian kings of Yüeh, in order to give themselves a Chinese origin, identified Yü with the ancestor of their family whose tomb was at the foot of the mountain K'uai-chi. Possibly the Chou tribes on conquering the Shang had the same motive when they connected the tradition of Yü with that of Hou Chi. Ku Chieh-kang on the other hand claims that the Yü lore arose in the south where a temple and grave attributed to him now stand near the city of Shaohsing in Chekiang, and where he was officially worshipped up to the time of the republic.²⁹ Besides this connection, he points out that two collections of poetry, the *Ch'u T'z'u*, and *T'ien Wên*, which belong to the south are full of tales of Yü. Ku Chieh-kang's explanation of Yü's connection with the Chou clans was that it was made in order to make him acceptable in the north. This would be in keeping with the theory that the progressive addition of traditional figures to Chinese history was due to the assimilation of barbarian peoples, and that their gods and heroes were included in the Chinese pantheon in order to make it appear they were all one people and thus aid in the unification of the empire.

The tradition of Yü's journey to the south and his death and burial at K'uai-chi is not found in the *Shu-ching*, but Mo-ti³⁰ mentions it, and it is found in the *Bamboo Annals*³¹ and in the *Shih-chi*.³² Ssu-ma Ch'ien mentions having heard of it in his eulogy of Yü, but does not refer to it in the *Annals* (*pên-chi*),

²⁹ The temple to Yü at Shaohsing, Chekiang which had deteriorated greatly since the Republic from lack of repairs, has recently been thoroughly repaired and restored.

³⁰ Mei, Y. P., *Ethical and Philosophical Works of Motse*, p. 131.

³¹ Legge, *Prolegomena*, vol. 3, p. 118.

³² Ssu-ma Ch'ien, *史記 Shih-chi* 2/26.

and in his description of his own journey to the south in his autobiography he gives only one short sentence to the subject, in which he states that he went to K'uai-chi to *t'an* 探 (meaning "to search for," or "to investigate") Yü's burial place.³³ The term used does not seem to justify Chavannes's interpretation that he found it. The chronicles of Kou-ch'ien 勾踐, (5th century B. C.), the founder of Yüeh, claim that this ruler was a descendant of Yü through a concubine of Shao-kang 少康, one of the later rulers of the so-called Hsia dynasty founded by Yü. Shao-kang is said to have founded a fief at K'uai-chi in order that the worship and ceremonies to Yü might be continued.³⁴ Chavannes believes the K'uai-chi tradition to have arisen about 400 B. C.³⁵ Wang Chung 王充 (27-97 A. D.) of this region scoffed at the tradition of Yü's connection with K'uai-chi.³⁶ For some time the location of the grave was in doubt, but the finding of a stone near the present site similar to one used as a counterweight in lowering a coffin, commonly called *pien-shih* 筓石, and on which Sun Ch'üan 孫權 an emperor of Wu 吳 (222-280 A. D.), one of the Three Kingdoms, is said to have carved these characters, seems to have helped in localizing it.³⁷ Chavannes believes this stone to have been a relic of an earlier local religion.³⁸ It is recorded that a temple to Yü was established at K'uai-chi in 946 A. D., but it was not until the Ming dynasty that the tablet with Ta Yu Ling 大禹陵, was erected.³⁹ On the other hand there is a tradition that Yü came from the Hsi-chiang 西羌, non-Chinese tribes of Kansu and Szechuan.⁴⁰ Mr. C. W. Bishop points out that the kings of Yüeh had the same clan name as the founders of Ch'u, and that Yü may have been a God of the same bronze-using peoples who founded the various Chinese states of the Yangtze basin, and that if Yü was a God of the waters, the bore in the Ch'ien-t'ang River may have had something to do with

³³ 上會稽探禹穴 *Shih-chi* 30/6b.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, 41/1a.

³⁵ Chavannes, E., *Bulletin de l'Ecole Française d'Extrême Orient*, XIV, p. 35.

³⁶ Forke, *Lun-hêng*, I, 335; II, 246-247.

³⁷ 紹興府志 *Shao-hsing-fu chih*, 22.

³⁸ Chavannes, E., B. E. F. E. O., XIV, p. 36.

³⁹ *Shao-hsing-fu chih*, 22.

⁴⁰ Chavannes, E., *Mem. Hist.* I, pp. 97-98.

the localization of the Yü cult in this region.⁴¹ Recently neolithic stone monuments have been found in south-west Shansi near the traditional capitals of the model emperors, and when archeological work has been carried out on these sites, new light may be thrown on these traditions.⁴²

Maspero holds that these flood stories are adaptations of an old mythological theme to a local one, and that all we know of the old mythology connects itself with certain gods and heroes and cults in well defined areas. Probably certain ceremonies of the cult or prayers chanted at the great dances in honor of the founders of the great houses and dynasties helped to preserve the legends. All great families had, in addition to the lists of real ancestors, a list of far-off ones. Finally, the Chinese deluge and these other flood stories had nothing to do with Mediterranean lore, and the word deluge is badly chosen, as these legends carry no idea of trespass or punishment, as in the West. They are based on a primitive theme of the origin of men and civilization which preserves a tradition that at the beginning the earth was covered with water.⁴³

It can be seen from the study of the Yü legends that there were two lines of tradition—one from which the mythological and marvelous had fallen away, leaving an interpretation acceptable to the rational thinking of the early philosophers; and another which either preserved or added these mythological elements to meet the needs of other types of mind among the great masses of people which were assimilated into Chinese culture.

As has been mentioned before, the emperor Yao, the earliest chronologically of the model emperors, is connected by some scholars with a sun myth. All reference to the sun is effaced in the account of his reign in the *Shu-ching*, but in the *Shih-chi* he is referred to as appearing like the sun, which Granet says is "all that is left of an old myth in which Yao is presented as a subduer of suns, or as the sun itself."⁴⁴ In the *Shu-ching*, however, there are references to functionaries called Hsi and Ho, supposedly

⁴¹ C. W. Bishop, "The Beginnings of North and South in China," *Pacific Affairs*, Sept. 1934, p. 323, and correspondence on the subject.

⁴² Goodrich, L. C., "Phallic Monuments in Shansi," *Journal of North China Branch, Royal Asiatic Society*, 1932.

⁴³ Maspero, "Legendes Mythologiques dans le Chou King," *Journal Asiatique*, 1924, pp. 48-82, *passim*.

⁴⁴ Chavannes, *op. cit.*, p. 42; Granet, *op. cit.*, p. 10.

astronomers, who are commanded by Yao to make careful observations of the heavens and the heavenly bodies and deliver the seasons to the people. They are also commanded to dwell at the four cardinal points to receive as a guest the rising sun, to convey the setting sun to rest, and to regulate the sun's seasonal sojourn at midsummer and winter.⁴⁵ Maspero points out that outside the historical works, these names Hsi and Ho denote not two persons but one. In other texts, such as the *Shan Hai Ching*, 離騷 *Li Sao*, and *T'ien Wen*, are references to a sun myth and to a personage, clearly mythological, Hsi-Ho, the mother of the sun or suns, who washed them each morning and conducted their chariots on their daily tour. These suns are described as living beings but of a particular kind, spherical and made of fire, and each sun has as its animating principle a raven with three feet. There were ten of these suns, which mounted in order, each hour of the cycle, the great *fu-sang* 扶桑 tree, at the extreme east of the sky. The *Shan Hai Ching* tells the story that on a certain day they mounted the *fu-sang* all together and the earth began to burn, but I 羿 the archer, slew all but one with his arrows, and so saved the earth.⁴⁶ Reference to the tradition of the rising of the ten suns and the melting of metal and liquefying of rock is found in the work of Chuang-tzŭ. In *Huai-nan-tzŭ* this tradition is connected with Yao, to the effect that up to the time of Yao ten suns rose simultaneously and destroyed herbs and seeds. In the *Lu Shih Ch'un Ch'iu*, a work attributed by some to the Han dynasty, this same connection of the rising of the ten suns with Yao is found.⁴⁷

Although these are all relatively late versions, the earliest reference being in the *T'ien Wên*, dating about 300 B. C., Maspero attempts to prove their antiquity by a very interesting study of Chinese characters. For instance, the character for dawn, *hsü* 旭 represents nine suns, nine being the number of suns which remained at the bottom of the tree while the tenth mounted it. The character *tung* 東, meaning east, represents the sun rising in the branches of a tree. The character for light and brightness, *kao* 杲

⁴⁵ Legge, vol. 3, pp. 18-21.

⁴⁶ Maspero, "Legendes Mythologiques dans le Chou King," *Journal Asiatique*, 1924, pp. 8, 18.

⁴⁷ Erkes, "Chinesisch-Amerikanische Mythenparallelen," *T'oung Pao*, vol. 24, pp. 34, 36, 38.

represents the sun above the tree, whereas the character for obscurity or darkness, *miao* 杳, represents the sun below the tree.⁴⁸

Maspero points out that the rôle of mother conductress of the sun was not unique—Chinese mythology had a mother conductress of the moon also. Again, he finds both these personalities paralleled in the myths of the southern peoples, and that both mythologies had similar conceptions of the nature of the earth.⁴⁹

Edouard Erkes enlarges this field of comparison to include both sides of the Pacific. The theme of the multiplicity of the suns, the burning of the earth and its rescue, are said to have parallels among the Battak of Sumatra and the Semang of Malacca. The Shastika of California have a myth in which the number of suns is the same as in China, and also a parallel myth of the multiplicity of moons and the freezing of the earth. Among the Bella Coola Indians, the idea prevails that the world is illuminated by a successive lighting of torches up till midday and then they are successively extinguished. One day the king's son lights them all at once and the earth begins to burn. Some other world conceptions among these people are strikingly like the Chinese. For instance, there is a pillar that supports the sky and a giant held by ropes who stands guard in the eastern sky. Moreover, the Shangtung sculptures in stone show a giant who swallows a child (or soul), while the Chuchee have legends of soul-eating giants. They also have a conception of a square earth somewhat resembling the Chinese idea. The giant bird and fish which are so prominent in the philosophy of Chuang-tzū and Lieh-tzū also have parallels in the lore of the Chuchee. Erkes thinks these parallels at least worthy of consideration;⁵⁰ Laufer says that during the "last one or two thousand years there has been an intimate contact between

⁴⁸ This argument does not necessarily prove the antiquity of the myth—changes were made in the characters under Ch'ín Shih Huang, and this representation seems a very natural one.

⁴⁹ Maspero, "Legendes Mythologiques dans le Chou King," *Journal Asiatique*, 1924, pp. 14, 38.

⁵⁰ Erkes, "Chinesisch-Amerikanische Mythenparallelen," *T'oung Pao*, vol. 24, pp. 42-53 passim; Warneck, *Die Religion der Battak*, p. 43; Schebesta, "Über the Semang auf Malaka," *Anthropos*, vol. 19, p. 1, p. 1010; Powers, "Tribes of California," *Contributions to North American Ethnology*, vol. 3, p. 251; Boas, "The Mythology of the Bella Coola Indians," *The Jesup North Pacific Expedition*, vol. 1, pp. 136, 102-3; vol. 8, pp. 292-99; Chavannes, *La Sculpture sur Pierre*, p. 31.

the two continents and that currents and undercurrents of Asiatic thought have swept over America, especially in the northern part."⁵¹

According to Erkes, the earliest traces of the sun myth in the *T'ien Wen* probably go back to inscriptions on old stone monuments dating from about 500 B. C. The attempt at interpretation of old stone carvings has been offered as one solution of the growth of legendary literature through many centuries. The *Shan Hai Ching*, which contains so much legendary and mythical material, was supposed to accompany and explain a book of art. It is significant that nearly all this type of material belongs to Southern China, the home of Taoist literature. Again, as in the myths and legends of Yü, there are two lines of tradition. In the *Shu-ching* Yao is a highly humanized figure and is stripped of all but the vestiges of myth, while the imaginative element is greatly enlarged and supplemented in the Taoist literature of the southern state of Ch'u.

The story of Shun, as already mentioned, seems to have been based on the plot of a folktale which fitted well the Confucian ideal of filial piety, and carries reminiscences of ordeal. In later accretions to Shun's story given by Mencius and Szü-ma Ch'ien, he carries some of the attributes of a culture hero, and appears in the rôle of husbandman, a potter, fisherman and "city-forming prince."⁵² Erkes says that the story of Shun's persecution as found in Mencius fits in well with similar tales in both Indian and Siberian tribes. In the *Bamboo Annals*, an historical record claimed to have been found in a tomb in 281 A. D., and whose marvelous tales are said to have taxed the credulity of the Confucian scholars of that day,⁵³ there are found notes attributing to the model emperors all the miraculous signs that go with great sages and prophets, such as miraculous births, great stature, physical peculiarities and signs and wonders.⁵⁴ The instances given above do not exhaust the mythological and legendary material on which in part the history

⁵¹ Laufer, "Columbus and Cathay," *JAOS* 51. 99.

⁵² Legge, vol. 2, p. 346; Chavannes, *op. cit.*, pp. 72-76.

⁵³ The chronology, however, of the *Bamboo Annals* has been found by comparison with that of the Yin bones and others to be more reliable than Szü-ma Chien, according to C. W. Bishop, "Chronology in Ancient China," *JAOS* 52. 232-247.

⁵⁴ Hummel, *Autobiography of a Chinese Historian*, p. 77, n. 1.

of Chinese beginnings seems to be founded, but it is enough to show that China's early texts have the same basis as those of other old civilizations.

Not only has the history of the model emperors been rationalized from a foundation of tradition, myth, and folklore, but it also has roots in another institution, that of divine kingship. The high ethical ideal of kingship attributed to the model emperors—of men who did nothing, but through the cultivation of virtue reacted on their environment, causing moral reformation of the people and bringing prosperity to the nation—has been built on a much more ancient model. It fits almost perfectly into the ideal of divine kingship described in Hocart's *Kingship*, a study of a great variety of monarchical institutions. Hocart says: "The invention of a man who did nothing with his hands but existed and reacted on his environment at a distance like the sun, was one of the most momentous in the history of man; it was nothing less than the invention of government."⁵⁵

In the *Book of Rites*, 禮記 *Li Chi*, which contains detailed records of ancient usages, the ritual used by the emperor at the inauguration of the seasons is given, and also a list of calamities which would befall if the ritual corresponding to the season was not carried out at the proper time. This ritual was still used after the beginning of the Christian era. Thus in historical times, there is evidence of the concept of a king who simply by the performance of consecrated ritual caused natural forces to function regularly and brought good government and prosperity to the people. The earliest philosophical system of China, attributed to Yü, describes the interaction of the different virtues on corresponding natural forces. According to this tradition Yü was successful as a ruler because he received from heaven the "Great Plan," *Hung Fan*, by which the proper relationship between the virtues and the natural forces were established.⁵⁶

From the accounts in the *Li Chi*, previously mentioned, it can be seen why the calendar was of supreme importance to one who would hold the royal power, for if ritual was not carried out at the proper season, the orderly course of nature on which the kingship depended was disturbed. The importance of the calendar is seen in Yao's instructions to his supposed astronomers, Hsi and Ho, but in

⁵⁵ Hocart, *Kingship*, p. 46.

⁵⁶ Legge, vol. 3, p. 323.

this rationalized account its purpose is for the delivering of the seasons to the people. The importance of this function is seen again in connection with another custom of ancient kingship, circumambulation. Shun is recorded as making a tour of inspection of his realm, beginning in the east and then going to the other cardinal points, at each point meeting the nobles and rectifying their calendars and ceremonies.⁵⁷ This circumambulation according to the course of the sun is a practice common also in many coronation ceremonies and other ritual, such as marriage and initiation. In historical times in China this circumambulation was simplified to a tour of the four gates of the city.

The idea that the virtue practised by ancient sage emperors was in reality magic, analogous to that of the medicine man, save that it was used in the political sphere, is borne out by a striking incident in the tales about Yü. The submission of the Miao tribes is said to have been accomplished by the dissemination of virtue by the Great Yü—the virtue in this instance being synonymous with dancing with feathers on the steps of his palace.⁵⁸ Liang Ch'i-ch'ao cites the *Narratives of the States*, Kuo-yü, 國語 as giving direct evidence of the time when the chieftain was priest and ruler, and chosen from among the people "whose wisdom transcended the obvious."⁵⁹ These people it is said were called wizards.

The concept of righteousness, virtue, or justice in a king as imposing regularity on the natural order of the universe and bringing abundance to the earth has many striking parallels. As a result of his study of monarchial systems from Europe to the Pacific, Hocart believes that all varieties spring from the same original, the institution of "divine kings," which he says is the earliest known religion, though not necessarily the most primitive. He quotes the following parallel from the Mahābhārata: "Any king by good conduct can produce the age of bliss and perfection, or that of evil."⁶⁰ This same sentiment is quoted by a king of Khotan who makes himself responsible for a natural calamity that has befallen his domain. In Ceylon, an old chronicle relates that "a king who observes righteousness surely obtains rain in due season." The Babylonians believed that the king's justice

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 18-21, 35.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 66.

⁵⁹ Liang Ch'i-ch'ao, *op. cit.*, p. 143.

⁶⁰ Hocart, *op. cit.*, p. 48.

caused prosperity.⁶¹ Joseph was thought to be prosperous because the Lord was with him. The Messianic hope expresses the idea that the Messiah by righteousness brings in the millenium.⁶² Very striking is the ideal expressed by Homer in the words of Odysseus to his wife: "Thy fame shall reach the wide heavens, like that of some blameless king who, in fear of god, ruling over men, many and stalwart, upholds the right, and the black earth bears wheat and barley, the trees are laden with fruit, the flocks bear young without fail, the sea provides fish, by reason of good government, and the people prosper under him."⁶³ In Europe, both in Burgundy and in Sweden, bad crops were believed to be due to the king's negligence in regard to ritual. This particular emphasis was lost in England and France, but the attribute of divinity still clung to some early kings who were called saints, and who because of their piety had miraculous powers of healing, such as Edward the Confessor in England and Gontran in France.⁶⁴

Hocart believes that the concept of the divinity of kings, and the divine king's power over the regularity of the seasons and crops, and that of the moral law (expressed as virtue, righteousness, justice, etc.) over the natural forces is the direct consequence of the identification of the king with the sun. He says that the dogma "the king is the Sun-god" is found in Egypt, Asia Minor, India, Tahiti, and Persia.⁶⁵ Japan should also be added to this list, as her reigning house of the present day claims descent from the Sun-Goddess. Traces of her power over the fertility of the rice fields may be found in the fragments of legends combined in the earliest Japanese historical works.⁶⁶ The Chinese ideal seems to have been built on the same general pattern, and the analogy of this pattern with that of the sun and its function and power over the earth is striking. It is seen in the description of Yao's influence over his empire in the *Yao-tien*, in the comparison of Yao

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, p. 35; Jātaka, No. 276; Meissner *Babylonien and Assyrien*, pp. 65 ff.

⁶² Genesis, Chap. 39, v. 2 ff.; Isaiah, Chap 11.

⁶³ *Odyssey*, Book xix, 108-114.

⁶⁴ Hocart, *op. cit.*, p. 49.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 18

⁶⁶ Aston, W. G., *Nihongi, Transactions and Proceedings of the Japan Society*, Supplement I; Chamberlain, B. H., *Ko-ji-ki, Transactions of Asiatic Society of Japan*, Supplement X.

with the sun in the *Shih-chi*, as well as his apparent connection with other sun myths. This idea is also highly developed in the philosophical writings of the period.⁸⁷

China retained down to modern times an ideal of a highly ethical concept of kingship based on this model, but one which she developed according to her own cultural pattern.

The Background and Conditions out of which the Lore arose

This lore, as has been mentioned already, is considered by many critical scholars today to have been the product of the fourth century B. C., not factual material of 2000 B. C., and the Golden Age sponsored by it is believed to have no basis in fact. It is obvious from the materials presented in this study that the ideas involved were those prevalent in the philosophical writings of the period in which the lore arose. Some of the arguments in favor of this dating of the lore will be given briefly. Liang Ch'i-ch'ao points out that "three of the chapters of the Yu and Hsia dynasties seem posthumous accounts of a later generation."⁸⁸ Ku Chieh-kang bases his hypothesis that the first few chapters of the *Shu-ching* dealing with the model emperors are forgeries, *wei* 偽, of the fourth or fifth century B. C. on the scarcity of the references to the model emperors in the *Analects*, the most reliable source for the Ch'un Ch'iu period—there being only four; the nature of these references, for instance, Shun's filial piety is not mentioned, although the disciples of Confucius often discussed this subject with him; and the fact that the sections dealing with the model emperors in the *Shu-ching* are easy reading, while the others are often exceptionally difficult. He also rates them late because of linguistic evidence and the character of the ideas expressed. As mentioned before, the opening line of the accounts of the three reigns mark them as not being contemporary accounts.

Ku Chieh-kang maintains that there are four traditional assumptions concerning the ancient period of Chinese history which must be discarded. First, the idea that the Chinese came from one original stock. From the evidence of the *Odes* and other sources, there were in earliest times many small kingdoms in close proximity. There was at that time only a clan consciousness and not a

⁸⁷ Legge, vol. 3, p. 33.

⁸⁸ Liang Ch'i-ch'ao, *Chinese Political Theories*, p. 26.

race consciousness, and the reason that the Chinese later used the name Hsia to designate their race was probably that its civilization was superior to that of its contemporary neighbors. Li Chi in *The Formation of the Chinese People* brings some evidence to bear on this point, as he attempts to prove that twelve racial strains are found in the Chinese race today.

Second, the idea that all China at the time of the Golden Age was under one rule. The *Odes* refer to many small kingdoms existing together. The bone fragments from the Shang dynasty give the names of small localities only; no states are mentioned. China of the Chou dynasty, which followed the Shang, included only the present provinces of Shensi, Honan, and Shantung, and the southern part of Shansi and Hopei, while the empire of the Golden Age is represented as covering a much larger territory, approximately that of the Warring States, 481-255 B. C.

Third, the myth that certain traditional personages were men. He says that by the close of the Spring and Autumn period, 481 B. C., all the demigods of the Chinese had been transformed into men.

Fourth, the concept of an ancient Golden Age. As has been stated before, the *Odes*, China's earliest literature, give a very different picture from that described in the *Shu-ching*, and the ideals of the Golden Age are those arising during the period of the Warring States, and not those of the *Odes*.⁶⁹

Politically, the age in which the lore seems to have arisen was the age of the breakdown of feudalism, the old aristocracy, and the suzerainty of the Chou kings. The great Chou confederacy received its death blow with the invasion of the Ch'uan barbarians in 771 B. C. At this time the emperor was killed and the capital was moved eastward to Loyang. Henceforth the emperor held only nominal control. Disintegrating forces had been at work for some time, as the results of the expansion of the feudal states and the assimilation of large numbers of barbarian peoples. The Chou period, beginning with many small states, by a process of conquest and assimilation, ended with seven large ones. When the border states began to expand and take in even greater numbers of alien peoples, the disruption of the old order, sanctions, and loyalties was even greater. The strong tribes extended their borders at the expense of the

⁶⁹ Ku Chieh-kang, *Ku Shih Pien*, vol. 1, from a translation of a summary of the status of the lore made by Dr. A. W. Hummel.

weak. The dynasty ended with a period called the Warring States, 戰國 *Chan Kuo*, which continued until one of the border states, Ch'in, succeeded in gaining the ascendancy, and united China for the first time as an empire (221 B. C.).

The period was one of the great unrest, characterized by a spirit of pessimism and criticism. Many cultural and social changes were taking place to meet the exigencies of the new conditions. The amalgamation of small groups into larger ones and the changes of power due to constant wars brought about greater communication among all the peoples who were finally united to form the empire. Better means of communication stimulated trade, as well as an exchange of ideas. Coined money is said to have been introduced at this time and this probably facilitated the change from agricultural to town economy and the consequent growth of a wealthy merchant class, thus bringing about the destruction of the feudal aristocracy and a leveling of class distinctions. Those with ability among the lowly rose to the highest positions in the land. The most accurate pictures of this period are found in the *Odes*, of which the following examples give a vivid picture of the changes that were taking place, of the distress arising out of the economic conditions due to constant wars, as well as of the spirit of criticism and pessimism prevalent at this time.

"In the States of the east large and small,
The looms are empty.
Thin shoes of dolichos fibre
Are made to serve to walk on the hoarfrost."

"The sons of boatmen
Have furs of the bear, and the grisly bear.
The sons of the poorest families
Form the officers in public employment."⁷⁰

"But we the ceaseless toilers in the king's service
Cannot even plant our millet and rice,
What will our parents rely on?"

"You awe-inspiring ministers of State
Why are you so unjust?
Heaven is multiplying its afflictions
The people are grumbling
And yet you do not correct or bemoan yourselves."

⁷⁰ Legge, vol. 4, pp. 353, 355.

"Ah! Had I known it would be thus with me
I had better not have been born."⁷¹

This period is also characterized by the rise of a scholar class from among the lowly. Education was no longer the exclusive right of the nobility. Rulers sought out the talented among the people to help them. As in Greece, there was a class similar to the sophists, and later there followed those who founded the great schools of thought.

The great minds of the day turned to the doctrines of the lore and the examples of the ancient kings for a solution of the disturbed condition in which they lived. Descriptions of these conditions occur in the writings of the period. Mencius, in speaking of the time of Confucius which preceded him, says: "The world fell into decay and principles faded away. Perverse speakings and oppressive deeds waxed rife again. There were instances of ministers murdering their sovereigns. Confucius was afraid." Moreover, Mencius, in speaking of his own age, says: "Never was there a time farther removed than the present from the rise of a true sovereign; never was there a time when the sufferings of the people from tyrannical government were more intense than the present."⁷²

Szu-ma Ch'ien records that in Mencius' time wars had greatly increased and thousands fell in one battle. According to Ku Chieh-kang, "those who had an eye to the salvation of the world of that day found it very hard to bear," and advocated subjugation by virtue instead of force. The Lore arose as a curb on the military class. The pacifistic tendencies of the Chinese of this period grew out of an intimate experience of what war meant. The ancient Yao, Shun, and Yü, whose traditions could easily be interpreted to fit the ideals of the philosophers of the age, were made models of the virtues needed for the salvation of the age, and were held up as examples to contemporary kings to curb their avarice and militant spirit. Yü's name was not connected with those of Yao and Shun until the period of the Warring States, when the theories for which the lore stood were being worked out.

Not only was the lore the outgrowth of the conditions outlined

⁷¹ Hu Shih, *Development of the Logical Method in Ancient China*, pp. 4, 7, 9; Legge, vol. 4, pp. 132, 310.

⁷² Legge, vol. 2, pp. 281, 184.

above, but it was also very closely connected with the idea of unification and new geographical concepts which found expression at this time in the *Yü Kung* and the *Shan Hai Ching*.⁷³ It can readily be seen how the absorption of small states into larger ones and the assimilation of many alien people into China's culture would force this idea into her consciousness. "The idea of an ancient unification was invented to facilitate the actual unification which began at the close of the Chan Kuo period."⁷⁴ The manipulators of history attached Yü's name to a book of geography descriptive of the times in which they lived and made his tradition of dividing the empire into nine *chou* fit their own times, thus finding sanction in antiquity for what was taking place. Ku-Chieh-kang points out that formerly when the people of the north noticed that the southern barbarians tattooed their bodies and the people of Ch'ü chattered like birds, they were ashamed to associate with them, but after the rise of the idea of an ancient unification connected with the nine *chou* theory, they realized that after all they were all sons and daughters of Huang-ti and Yao and Shun.⁷⁵ In this way they were able to unite all the peoples which make up China in modern times.

The *Shan Hai Ching*, which belongs to this period, was also a product of new geographical ideas which had been seeping in over the trade routes from the Mediterranean world, giving China a new world view. The ideas which first came carried geographical information both real and mythical. China began to realize that she was only a part of a larger world, and began to reconstruct that outer world and her own from the information which came to her. Maspero says that there were two great waves of foreign influence coincident approximately with the conquests of Darius and later with those of Alexander in India and Central Asia. The *Shan Hai Ching* contains descriptions of reproductions (now lost) of designs Yü is supposed to have engraved on the nine tripods. These designs show the square earth surrounded by four seas and the strange peoples and monsters inhabiting the confines of the world.

⁷³ Ku Chieh-Kang, "The Origin of the Ch'in and Han Unification of China and the World View of the Period of the Warring States," translation by A. W. Hummel of a lecture now included in the *Ku Shih Pien*, vol. 2.

⁷⁴ Liang Ch'í-ch'ao, *op. cit.*, p. 26.

⁷⁵ See note 73.

This book contains excellent material for a study of comparative folklore. Maspero states that both Hindu and Hellenistic folklore is mixed with that of the Chinese in these tales.⁷⁶ Investigation may reveal an even wider sphere of comparison. These new geographical concepts were mixed with the old traditions to find sanction for a growing race consciousness, the necessity for unity, and a new world view.

Who were the authors of this interpretation of traditional material? Hirth points out that the dependence of the model emperors on the advice of their ministers in all important matters is very significant, and says "it is reasonable to assume that not an independent historian but certain parties interested in raising the importance of their own class invented or modified the old records, so as to lay the intellectual fatherhood of great decisions on ministers or philosophical advisers."⁷⁷

That the Chinese should have used the method of finding sanction for reforms and for their ideals by reinterpreting ancient traditional material was very natural. It had been a very widespread practice among many cultures. The sanction of antiquity was an especially strong one with the Chinese, however. Confucius' attitude toward the ancients is well known. The worship of ancestors also emphasizes this attitude. The methods used in the creation of the lore have been used many times since, as is shown in Ku Chieh-kang's discussion of the doctrine of the five elements on history. To the philosophers, the only solution for the conditions in which they lived seemed a moral one, and consequently they turned for sanction to the ancient mores of the race. The ancient mythological material on which the lore is based must have been undergoing for some time a gradual rationalization at the hands of the philosophers and rational thinkers, and without realizing it, they were myth makers. Malinowski says: "The function of myth briefly is to strengthen tradition and endow it with greater value and prestige by tracing it to more supernatural reality of ancient events." He also says: "Myth is a constant product of living faith, which is in need of miracles, of sociological status which demands precedent, of moral rule which requires sanction."⁷⁸

The Chinese based their sanction for moral rule on a golden age

⁷⁶ Maspero, *La Chine Antique*, pp. 612, 820.

⁷⁷ Hirth, *Ancient History of China*, p. 33.

⁷⁸ Malinowski, *Myth and Primitive Psychology*, p. 91.

in antiquity, and not on the supernatural, as was the case in some other cultures. Furthermore, throughout her history China has possessed a high civilization, and has been the carrier of very definite culture traits. Although she has been repeatedly overthrown by less civilized groups, yet she has been able to hold these traits almost unimpaired and to impose them upon her conquerors. At the time the lore arose, the foundations of the old culture were being threatened by alien elements and subversive doctrines, and the lore was a desperate effort at self preservation.

It is the opinion of Laufer that "the theory of perfect seclusion and isolation of ancient Chinese culture can no longer be upheld."⁷⁹ China's kinship with other parts of the world is seen in the similarity of myths, of fundamental ideas of kingship, and of world conceptions. The methods of compilers of the lore are also not unique with China. A very close parallel is found in the compilation of the early books of the Pentateuch. With both the Chinese and the Hebrews, the motive seems to have been that of preservation—in one case, that of an ethical ideal based on ancient mores and the sanction of antiquity; in the other, that of a religious ideal based on the supernatural.

⁷⁹ Laufer, "Some Fundamental Ideas of Chinese Culture," in *Journal of Race Development*, vol. 5, p. 160.

NOTES ON E. H. PALMER'S "THE QUR'ÂN"

A. R. NYKL

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

IN PREPARING for the printer my translation of the Qur'ân into Czech I had occasion to check up on a number of translations into other languages, and was rather surprised to discover a considerable number of serious mistakes and oversights in E. H. Palmer's translation (Oxford, 1880, 1900). These may have been already noticed by others, but have not been corrected in the two reprints of the *Sacred Books of the East* text in the "World's Classics" of the Oxford University Press, 1928 and 1933. Professor R. A. Nicholson tells me that, though asked to write an Introduction, he was not requested to correct the mistakes in the text. The following seemed to me the most important ones:

II, 58: **وَإِذْ قُلْتُمْ** "when they said"; Rodwell correct.

283: **مِنْ رِجَالِكُمْ** "from amongst their men"; R. correct.

تَرُضُّونَ "he chooses"; R. correct.

IV, 135: **وَكُتِبَهِ** left out; R. correct.

V, 18: **وَيُخْرِجُهُمْ مِنَ الظُّلُمَاتِ إِلَى النُّورِ بِإِذْنِهِ** left out.

VI, 12: **الَّذِينَ خَسِرُوا أَنْفُسَهُمْ فَهُمْ لَا يُؤْمِنُونَ** "but those who waste their souls will not believe" is translated in

20: "those who lose their souls do not believe"; R. translates more correctly.

46: **أَنْظُرْ كَيْفَ نَصَرَفَ الْآيَاتِ ثُمَّ هُمْ يَصْذَقُونَ** left out; in verse 65 Palmer translates: "See how we turn about the signs"; in verse 105:

"Thus do we turn about the signs." Neither R. is consistent. Verse 46: "See! how we vary our wondrous verses (signs)! yet they turn away from them!" Verse 65: "See how variously we handle the wondrous verses." Verse 105: "Thus variously do we apply our signs" (in note: the verses of the Koran). This seems too much variety and freedom in translation.

VII, 177: *مَنْ يَهْدِ اللَّهُ فَهُوَ الْمُهْتَدِي وَمَنْ يُضِلِّ*
فَأُولَئِكَ هُمُ الْخَاسِرُونَ left out.

VIII, 61: *وَلَا يَحْسِبَنَّ الَّذِينَ كَفَرُوا سَبَقُوا* "Deem not that those who misbelieve can win"; here also R. seems to have followed Kasimirski's "*ne. crois pas*," as if the text had *تُحْسِبَنَّ*. Both R. and Palmer appear to have leaned on Kasimirski a good deal. The same error in Sale and others. Megerlin, Ullmann correct.

IX, 32: *وَيَأْتِي اللَّهَ إِلَّا أَنْ يَتِمَّ نُورُهُ* "but God will not have it that we should perfect His light"; R. correct.

34: *بِالْبَاطِلِ* "openly"; R. correct.

XII, 65: *كَيْلٍ بَعِيرٍ* and *وَلَمِيرٍ أَهْلَنَا* left out.

100: *أَبَوُهُ* "his father"; R. correct.

109: *تَعْقِلُونَ* "have they then no sense?"; R. correct.

XIII, 12: *حَتَّى يَغْيَرُوا مَا بَانَفْسِهِمْ* "until they change it for themselves"; R. correct.

XIV, 28: *وَأَدْخِلْ* "but I will cause to enter"; R. correctly "But they shall be brought into."

- XVI, 20: **وَالَّذِينَ يَدْعُونَ** "And those on whom ye call"; R. correctly "the gods whom they call on."
- 102: **يَتَوَلَّوْهُ** "who take him for a patron"; R. better: "who turn away from God."
- XVIII, 81: **رَبِّكَ** "and their Lord." R. correct.
- 109: **وَلَوْ جِئْنَا بِمِثْلِهِ مَدَدًا** "though we brought as much ink again"; R. correctly "though we brought its like in aid."
- XIX, 88: **وَنُزِّلَهُ مَا يَقُولُ** "and we will make him inherit" seems a doubtful interpretation. R. correct.
- XX, 119: **فَأَكَلُوا مِنْهَا** "And they eat therefrom"; R. more correctly: "And they both ate thereof."
- XXI, 36: **وَالْيَنَّا تَرْجِعُونُ** (also in XXVIII, 70) "and unto us shall they return!" R. correctly "and unto US shall ye be brought back."
- 109: **أَذِّنْتَكُمْ عَلَىٰ سَوَاءٍ** "I have proclaimed (war) against all alike"; R. correctly "I have warned you all alike."
- XXIII, 67: **إِنَّكُمْ مِنَّا لَا تُنصَرُونَ** "verily against us ye will not be helped"; R. correctly: "for by US ye shall not be succored."
- 97: **وَإِنَّا عَلَىٰ أَنْ نُرِيكَ مَا نَعِدُهُمْ لَقَادِرُونَ** left out.
- 117: **اللَّهُ الْمَلِكُ الْحَقُّ** "God, the true"; R. correctly "God, the King, the Truth!"

- XXIV, 42: وَلِلَّهِ مَلَكُ السَّمَوَاتِ وَالْأَرْضِ وَإِلَى اللَّهِ left out.
- XXV, 38: فَدَمَّرْنَاهُمْ تَدْمِيرًا "for we will destroy them with utter destruction"; R. correctly: "And them destroyed we with *utter* destruction."
- XXVI, 57-58: فَأَخْرَجْنَاهُمْ مِنْ جَنَّاتٍ وَعُيُونٍ * وَكُنُوزٍ وَمَقَامٍ كَرِيمٍ "turn them out . . . and a noble station!" R. correctly: "Thus we caused them to quit . . . and splendid dwellings!"
- 200: كَذَلِكَ سَكَنَاهُ فِي قُلُوبِ الْمُجْرِمِينَ "Thus we made for it" (note: Infidelity; should be: revelation).
- XXVIII, 44: إِذْ قَضَيْنَا إِلَى مُوسَى الْأَمْرَ "when we decided for Moses, but afar off." R. "when we laid his charge on Moses."
- XXIX, 45: الَّذِينَ ظَلَمُوا مِنْهُمْ وَقَوْلُوا "those who have been unjust among them and who say: "; R. more correctly: "dealt wrongfully with you: And say ye."
- 75: هَاتُوا بُرْهَانَكُمْ فَعَلِمُوا أَنَّ الْحَقَّ لِلَّهِ "Bring your proof and know that the truth is God's." R. correctly: "Bring your proofs." And they shall know that the truth is with God alone."
- XXXI, 30: لَا يَأْتِي لِكُلِّ صَبَّارٍ شَكُورٍ "signs to every grateful person"; R. better: "signs to all patient, grateful ones."
- XXXIV, 25: قُل left out.

- XXXV, 10: فَسُقْنَاهُ إِلَى بَلَدٍ "and we irrigate therewith";
R. correctly: "then we drive them on."
- XXXVI, 46: وَمَا تَأْتِيهِمْ مِنْ آيَةٍ مِنْ آيَاتِ رَبِّهِمْ "and thou bringest them not any one of the signs of their Lord"; R. and others also incorrect. Translate: "None of God's signs comes to them, but, etc."
- 81: بَقَادِرٍ عَلَى أَنْ يَخْلُقَ مِثْلَهُمْ "able to create the like thereof?" R. more correctly "mighty enough to create your (read: "their") likes?"
- XXXVIII, 47: وَإِنَّهُمْ عِنْدَنَا لَمِنَ الْمُصْطَفَيْنَ الْأَخْيَارِ "they were with us of the elect, the best." Better: "they are, etc."
- 86: قُلْ مَا أَسْأَلُكُمْ عَلَيْهِ مِنْ أَجْرٍ "I do not ask thee for it any hire"; R. correct.
- XXXIX, 8: ذَلِكَُمُ اللَّهُ رَبُّكُمْ "That is God for you!" R. more correctly: "It is He who is God your Lord:"
- XLI, 24: وَنَقِيضَنَا لَهُمْ قُرَنَاءَ "we will allot to them mates," R.: "And we will appoint." Bonelli correctly: "Destinammo."
- XLII, 11/12: كَبُرَ عَلَى الْمُشْرِكِينَ مَا تَدْعُوهُمْ إِلَيْهِ "a great thing to the idolaters is that which ye call them to!" R. more correctly: "intolerable . . . is that faith to which thou dost call them."
- XLIII, 28: وَرَسُولٌ مُبِينٌ "and an apostle"; R. correctly "and an undoubted apostle."
- XLIV, 56: وَوَقَّيْهُمْ عَذَابَ الْجَحِيمِ "and we will keep

them from the torment of hell!" R. correctly: "and He shall keep them from the pains of Hell:—"

XLVI, 10: وَقَالَ الَّذِينَ كَفَرُوا لِلَّذِينَ آمَنُوا "And those who misbelieve say of those who believe"; R. also incorrectly: "But the infidels say of the believers," etc. Bonelli correctly: "a quelli."

XLVII, 22: وَيَقُولُ الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا "Those who misbelieve say"; R. correctly: "The believers say."

LIII, 56: فَبِأَيِّ آلَاءِ رَبِّكَ تَتَمَارَى "Which then of your Lord's benefits do ye dispute?" R. correctly: "Which then of thy Lord's benefits wilt thou make a matter of doubt?"

58: كَيْسَ لَهَا مِنْ دُونِ اللَّهِ كَاشِفَةٌ "there is none to discover it but God"; R. better: "and yet none but God can reveal *its time*."

LIV, 16-17 left out: وَنَذَرُ * وَلَقَدْ يَسْرُنَا
الْقُرْآنَ لِلذِّكْرِ فَهَلْ مِنْ مُدَكِّرٍ

LV, 11: وَالْحَبُّ ذُو الْعَصْفِ وَالرَّيْحَانُ "and grain with chaff and frequent shoots"; R. better: "And the grain with its husk, and the fragrant plants." In CV, 5: "like blades of herbage eaten down."

LVI, 96: فَسَبِّحْ بِاسْمِ رَبِّكَ الْعَظِيمِ "So celebrate the grand name of thy Lord!" is correctly rendered in LXIX, 52: "Therefore celebrate the name of thy mighty Lord!"

LXVI, 3: فَلَمَّا تَبَيَّنَتْ بِهِ وَأَظْهَرَهُ اللَّهُ عَلَيْه "and when she

gave information thereof and exposed it";
R. correctly: "and when she divulged it and
God informed him of this."

- LXVII, 20: *يَنْصُرْكُمْ مِنْ دُونِ الرَّحْمَنِ* "to help you against
the Merciful?" R. correctly: "to succour
you, except the God of Mercy?"
- LXVIII, 33: *لَوْ كَانُوا يَعْلَمُونَ* "if ye did but know!" R. cor-
rectly: "Ah! did they but know it."
- LXXIV, 52: *بَلْ يُرِيدُ كُلُّ امْرِئٍ* "Nay every man of them
wished that"; R. better: "And every one of
them would fain have." Cf. also LXXV, 5.
- LXXIV, 54: *فَمَنْ شَاءَ ذَكَرْهُ* "and let him who will remember
it" is translated correctly in LXXX, 12:
"and whoso pleases will remember it." R.
translates the former "And whoso is willing
beareth it in mind"; the latter "And whoso
will, it warneth him." The same lack of
consistency, as in VI, 46.
- LXXV verse [35] belongs before "again woe to thee"; and
[40] is to be put in place of [35].
- LXXXV, 4: *قَتِيلَ أَصْحَابِ الْأَخْدُودِ* "The fellows of the pit
were slain"; R. more correctly: "Cursed the
masters of the trench."
- LXXXVII, 1: "Celebrated" (wrongly corrected: celebrated
be); read: celebrate.
- XCIX, 6: *لِيُرَوْا أَعْمَالَهُمْ* "to show their works"; R. bet-
ter: "to behold their works."
- CIV, 8: *إِنَّهَا عَلَيْهِمْ مُّوَصَّدَةٌ* "Verily, it is an archway
over them"; R. "It shall verily rise over
them like a vault," inconsistent with the
translation of

XC, 20: *عَلَيْهِمْ نَارٌ مُّوَصَّدَةٌ* "for them is fire that closes in!" R. "Around them the fire shall close."

Many other smaller details could be pointed out, but neither these, nor the more important errors, diminish the great literary value of Palmer's work. It is to be desired, nevertheless, that no further reprints be published without a previous revision.¹



¹ This would be in keeping with Max Müller's Preface to the "Sacred Books of the East" (p. xx): "I can answer for myself and for those who have worked with me, that our translations are truthful, that we have suppressed nothing," etc.

BRIEF COMMUNICATIONS

κύβδα, a Karian Gloss

Among the handful of Karian glosses which have come down to us from the Greeks is the word κύβδα "a weight" (see, e. g., article "Karer" in Schrader-Nehring, *Reallexikon der indogermanischen Altertumskunde*; also article "Karische Sprache," by W. Brandenstein, in Pauly-Wissowa, *Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, Supplementband VI, 1935, col. 142).

Whatever may be thought of the linguistic placement of Karian on the basis of the glosses, names, and still uninterpreted graffiti from Egypt, it is clear that κύβδα does not bear on the problem, for it is obviously a loan-word from Semitic **kubdu* (nom.; acc. **kubda*) "weight": **kabida* "to be heavy." The root is not found in Arabic and Aramaic but is common in Canaanite (Hebrew; Punic names), Ras Shamra (*kbd* "to honor," pi'el), Ethiopic, and Akkadian (*kbt*). The noun formation, a "segholate" in -u-, is likely to be an archaic one for intransitives in -i-, to judge from the Hebrew, Aramaic, and Arabic evidence (see Barth, *Die Nominalbildung in den semitischen Sprachen*, § 24, a-c), though a direct dialectic reflex of the Semitic **kubdu* seems to occur only in Hebrew, as *kôbēd* "weight" (literal and figurative); the word occurs only four times, in the construct state, in the Old Testament and all of these occurrences are poetic. Negative evidence, however, can be but of slight value here and we have every reason to believe that all the Canaanite dialects possessed the word in its literal meaning as a term in common use. The best way to explain Karian *kubda* is to suppose that it was brought to the Karian coast by Phoenician traders (at a time when Phoenician still possessed the accusative ending -a?) and that from the general meaning of "weight" developed that of "a specific weight," whether in Phoenician itself or in the borrowed Karian form. The parallel instance that comes first to mind is the development of Latin *pōndus* to borrowed *pound* and *Pfund*.

EDWARD SAPIR.

Yale University.

A Line of Brāhmī (?) Script in a Babylonian Contract Tablet

In a contract tablet from Babylon, recording the sale of a slave-girl and dated in the 23d year of Artaxerxes, there occurs in a space obviously left for this purpose a line of script, the characters of which have been hitherto considered as unknown.¹ The position of this line in the context (as can be readily seen from the photographic reproduction) makes it probable, in my opinion, that it contains the name (or names) of a witness to the transaction. Other possibilities are of course by no means excluded. At any rate, the preceding four lines of the cuneiform contain names of such witnesses, all of them apparently good Babylonians.² The three lines of cuneiform that follow, forming the end of the tablet, contain the name of the scribe, the place (Babylon) and the date—the eleventh day of the month Adar in the 23d year of Artaxerxes.³

It seems to me that at least several of the characters of this unknown script exhibit striking similarities with the akṣaras of the Brāhmī alphabet, such as we know them from the inscriptions of Aśoka and others. In one case, that of the ninth character, counting from left to right, one can possibly claim identity with the Brāhmī akṣara *mu*.⁴


The first character of the line (counting from left to right) I also regard as similar to the Brāhmī *ma* (Bühler, No. 32, col. I,

¹ The tablet was published with a translation of the cuneiform by Theo. G. Pinches in the *PSBA*, 1882-1883, pp. 103-107. It is now at the British Museum, 81-11-3. It was brought to my attention by Mr. R. A. Bowman of the Oriental Institute, University of Chicago, to whom I am greatly indebted for many valuable suggestions. Prof. A. T. Olmstead has been likewise most helpful with his advice.

² The names of the principals in the transaction, with one possible exception, are also unquestionably Semitic. The buyer of the slave, however, is Urmanū son of Lišir. The name Urmanū does not seem to be Semitic, and actually occurs nowhere else except in this tablet. Lišir, on the other hand, is a good Semitic name.

³ This could be Artaxerxes I or Artaxerxes II. In the former case the date would be 441 B. C., in the latter 381 B. C. But the earlier date seems to be much more probable, as documents from Babylon dating from this period of Artaxerxes II's reign are exceedingly rare.

⁴ See Bühler, *Siebzehn Tafeln zur Indischen Palaeographie* (henceforth quoted as Bühler), plate II, No. 32, column IV.



Line of Script (possibly Brahmi) in a Babylonian Contract Tablet.

II and V), but the upper part of the letter forms a complete circle, a feature which I have not found in Brāhmī elsewhere. The second character presents a problem; the *k* element seems certain (see Bühler, id., No. 9), and the loop with the stroke added to the *k* on the left, seems on the whole akin to the *kha* in the Aśoka inscription at Kālsī (see Bühler, id., No. 10, col. II and III) although the position of the loop there is different. Nevertheless I, tentatively, regard the second character as *kha*. The third character is probably a combination (ligature?) of two consonants, though its form is puzzling to me. Concerning the upper character of this combination I have no suggestions to offer; the lower one, however, is similar to some of the later forms of Brāhmī *ha* (see Bühler, *Indische Palaeographie*, p. 7, No. 22). The fourth character looks very much like certain forms of the Brāhmī *ra* (see Bühler, table II, No. 34, col. XIII). The fifth character seems to be quite identical with the second character, which has been tentatively identified as *kha*. For the sixth character I suggest similarity with the Brāhmī *da* or *do* (see Bühler, id., No. 25, col. II, III and ff.), though the absence of a vertical stroke below is a difficulty. The seventh character is similar to the first and also to the ninth, differing from the latter in the presence of an additional stroke above (this stroke would normally indicate the vowel *i*, see Bühler, id., No. 32, col. III). This character, then, probably belongs to the *ma* group. The eighth character is puzzling but may represent a Brāhmī *ja* (see Bühler, id., No. 15, col. VI and VII). But this identification is very doubtful.⁵ The ninth character has already been discussed above. For the rest of the characters I am unable to give any definite suggestions.⁶

At the present time I am unable to obtain a satisfactory reading of this line. The first two syllables may read *makha*, which may be the first part of a name, likewise characters four and five may read *rakha*.⁷ I trust however that scholars with greater knowledge of Indian palaeography than my own will be more successful. In

⁵ Brāhmī *ta* is perhaps preferable (see Bühler, id., No. 18, col. II and IV).

⁶ But perhaps between characters ten and eleven, below the line, we have a Brāhmī *ta*, see Bühler, id., No. 23, col. VII.

⁷ Pāli has the name Makhādeva. I would like here to acknowledge my indebtedness to Prof. Truman Michelson, for his valuable suggestions with reference to identification of the characters.

spite of the difficulties here outlined, I am convinced that we have here some kind of a Brāhmī script, even though differing considerably from the type found in the Aśokan inscriptions. These differences can be easily accounted for by the early date of our tablet. Even if we should accept its date as of the 23d year of Artaxerxes II (381 B. C.), we still have over a century separating our script from even the earliest Aśokan inscription.⁸ The occurrence of a form of Brāhmī script in Babylon in the second half of the Vth century B. C. presents no difficulties. Since 500 B. C., at any rate, the Indus Valley and parts of the Panjab formed a part of the Persian Empire. Indian troops, as we know, participated already in the campaigns of Xerxes. There is also every reason to believe that commerce between Babylon and India existed during the Vth and VIth centuries B. C.⁹ However all definite conclusions will have to be postponed until a satisfactorily certain reading of this line is achieved.

G. V. BOBRINSKOY.

University of Chicago.

A Note on Early Arabian Military Organization

The term *hamīs* is one applied in classical Arabic to the army as it existed from the beginning of Islam up to the time of the Umayyad caliph Marwān II (744-50), who abolished this unit in favor of the *kurdūs*, a formation borrowed from the Byzantines (Greek *κοόρις*, *κόρης*, from Latin *cohors*, cohort). The origin and correct significance of the word *hamīs* have long been a subject of speculation among Arabists,¹ but up to the present time no satisfactory conclusion has been arrived at. This has been due in a large

⁸ We may of course have some specimens of Brāhmī writing which should be considered as prior to Aśoka; so the Erap coin, see Rapson, *Indian Coins*, p. 11 and plate IV, 8. Also K. P. Jayaswal, *JBORS*, XX, pp. 1-7, dates some Brāhmī seals from Patna as of the IVth century B. C. But the evidence is not absolutely definite in those cases.

⁹ See *Cambridge History of India*, vol. I, pp. 212 and 329. Prof. Olmstead calls my attention to a passage in a cuneiform tablet from Kish (dating probably from the reign of Darius the Great) where a Hindu woman (Hinduś), named Busasa is mentioned as the owner of a house in that city, see Louvre XIII, No. 218, line 21.

¹ Especially lately (1927) Rhodokanakis in Nielsen, *Altarabische Altertumskunde*, vol. I, p. 123, n. 5.

measure to a failure to take into consideration all of the linguistic aspects of the problem.

The *ḥamīs* itself was divided into five component parts: the *muqaddamah*, advance-guard; *qalb*, center; *maymanah*, right wing; *maysarah*, left wing and *sāqah*, rear-guard.² The *Fiqh al-Lughah*³ adds that it comprised from four to twelve thousand men, thus making it the largest military unit known to the Arabs. The best classical Arabic lexicons (*Tāj al-ʿArūs*, *Lisān al-ʿArab*, *al-Ṣiḥāḥ*) explain the etymology of the word on the basis of this fivefold division; the *Tāj* says that this is the definition accepted by the *ʿulamāʾ*. These three authorities are followed by the standard modern native works *Muḥiṭ al-Muḥiṭ* and *al-Shartūnī*.⁴ But there is by no means a unanimity of opinion in the matter. The *Tāj* also tenders the explanation, though rather secondarily, that the *ḥamīs* was so called because the plunder was divided up into five parts; this is obviously a later rationalization and is rightly rejected by Lane. The *Tāj* moreover adds the significant words, *wa-ḥamīs mawḍūʿ qadīm* "(the meaning of) *ḥamīs* is an old subject of debate."

Contrary to the convictions expressed by writers of various periods, the *ḥamīs* in its original form is not a borrowing from the Greeks or Iranians⁵ or a development of post-Islamic times.⁶ Its existence is far anterior to the rise of Islam. The Christian Umayyad poet al-Akḥṭal (b. ca. 640), who possessed a fine feeling for the old pre-Islamic speech of the desert, sings:

*wa-naġmaʿu li-al-ḥarb al-ḥamīs al-ʿaramramāʿ*⁷

Ibn-Hishām (d. ca. 834) quotes *ḥamīs* as being used by the Prophet's contemporaries as synonymous with *jayš*, army in the

² Ibn-Khaldūn, *Muqaddamah* (Cairo, 1284), p. 227; he uses the term *taʿbiyah* here as equivalent to *ḥamīs*.

³ Beirut, 1885, p. 220.

⁴ Von Kremer (*Culturgeschichte*, vol. I, p. 80) accepts this view. If the Arabs had adopted the original fivefold division from the Byzantines or Iranians it is difficult to understand why they did not borrow the name also, as they did with such terms as *kurdās* and *jayš* (Syriac *gaysā*).

⁵ Ibn-Khaldūn, loc. cit.

⁶ Vollers in *ZDMG*, vol. 50, p. 333; R. Levy, *The Sociology of Islam*, vol. I, p. 297.

⁷ Salhani, *Dīwān al-Aḥṭal* (Beirut, 1891), p. 249, line 3.

general sense: *fa-lammā ra'ū rasūl allāh . . . wa-al-jayš qāḥū Muḥammad wa-al-ḥamīs ma'ahu*.⁸ This word, moreover, occurs in South Arabic under the form *ḥmś*, and with the meaning "people, army, host."⁹ Since vowels are not indicated in South Arabic it is probable that the actual pronunciation was nearer to *ḥmīs*, thus making it identical with its North Arabic counterpart.

There can be little doubt that the Arabic *ḥamīs* is cognate with the Hebrew *ḥamūšim*. Both are passive participial constructions of the first stem (applying this term to Hebrew as well) of the respective verbs *ḥamasa* and *ḥāmaš* "to make, divide into, five."¹⁰ The Arabic is thus obviously cognate to the Hebrew and not a loan-word, as Wellhausen¹¹ has suggested. The attempted connection of the Hebrew *ḥamūšim* with the North Arabic root *ḥamasa* "became hard, rigorous; became vehement (war),"¹² must also be discarded, since the South Arabic *ḥmś* points to the first radical of the Hebrew as being **ḥā-* not *ḥā*. The original significance of both words, then, was an army of five divisions.

It is patent that the precise meaning of *ḥamūšim* was far from clear to the minds of the LXX, for they are anything but consistent and accurate in their translation of the passages where it occurs. Thus Ex. 13:18 has πέμπτη δὲ γενεὰ (1); Josh. 1:14 εὐζωνοί; 4:12 διεσκευασμένοι; Ju. 7:11 πεντήκοντα; Num. 32:17 προφολακῆν.¹³ The Vulgate, on the other hand, is much more consistent. In all the passages quoted the word in question is translated by *armati*, with the exception of Ju. 7:11, where we find *armatorum vigiliae*. Targum Onqelos interprets *ḥamūšim* in a similar sense: Ex. 13:18 *m^ezārzīn*. The true meaning of the word is plainly army, host, generalized from the original meaning of an army of five divisions. This can be checked by substituting the word *š'vā'ōth* (hosts) for

⁸ *Sirat Muḥammad*, ed. Wüstenfeld (Göttingen, 1859), p. 757.

⁹ J. A. Mordtmann, *Himjarische Inschriften und Alterthümer* (Berlin, 1893), p. 7.

¹⁰ A parallel derivation of the Latin *tribus* from *tres* is cited in Mordtmann and Müller, *Sabäische Denkmäler*, p. 24 (not accessible to the present writer).

¹¹ *Muḥammed in Medina* (Berlin, 1882), p. 267.

¹² Arnold B. Ehrlich, *Randglossen zur hebräischen Bibel* (Leipzig, 1908), vol. I, p. 209. Since *ḥamūšim* is a passive participle it could hardly be from an intransitive verb.

¹³ The form *ḥūšim* is here clearly a scribal error for *ḥamūšim*.

hamūšim in all instances where it occurs; it will be found to fit the sense of the passage perfectly.*

Graduate College, Princeton.

HAROLD W. GLIDDEN.

A Dubious Old Persian Tablet in Philadelphia

In a private collection¹ in Philadelphia is a tablet bearing an inscription presumably in Old Persian, but I believe the inscription can be shown to be a forgery.

The tablet is of red brick and approximately 11" by 8". Only one surface is inscribed, containing fourteen lines. The tablet is in very good condition except for a chip knocked from the lower right. Thus there may be one sign lost at the end of line 11. The tablet was at one time broken into two pieces, but the crack does not affect any of the inscribed sections.

The figures on the tablet are in intaglio relief. At the right is a seated figure, either divine or royal, perhaps meant for Ahuramazda. A figure with an upraised arm, presumably a herdsman, stands in the upper center. At the feet of this figure and to the left are a goat and three sheep. Flowers and grass along the lower edge indicate that the scene is a field.

The inscription is in the vacant sections between the figures. The following is a transliteration indicating roughly the position of the characters; the absence of a dash between characters means that the space is filled by one of the figures:











1.	<i>ma-za-du-i-sa-nu-:</i>	<i>a</i>	<i>ra-di-xa-ša-tu-ru-:</i>
2.	<i>:i-za-du-na-i-:</i>		<i>mi-na-ja-ta-ru-i-:-mi</i>
3.	<i>ra-ka-na-:-?-ra-ka</i>		<i>a-:-a-i-ru-na-:-vi-:-da</i>
4.	<i>ba-ga-: va</i>	<i>za</i>	<i>ra-ka : -ma-u?</i>
5.	<i>ha ya-:</i>	<i>ma</i>	<i>θa-i ša-ta</i>

* [Eduard Meyer, *Geschichte des Altertums*² II. 2. 217, note 3, connects the same words of Hebrew, Arabic, and Sabaean, though his interpretation, viz. "gefünzigert," differs slightly from the above. E. A. S.]

¹ The name and address of this collection may be got by communicating with the writer of this article. [The present owner admits that the genuineness of the tablet is doubtful. But the number of genuine Old Persian inscriptions is very small; and in recent years several have been published by scholars, which are now recognized as spurious or very doubtful. It therefore seems worth while to have a printed record of this tablet. EDITORS.]

6.	<i>ba</i>	<i>nu-?</i>
7.	<i>ga</i>	<i>θa</i>
8.	<i>a-ma-:</i>	<i>ra-?</i>
9.		<i>nu</i>
10.		<i>vi-:-a</i>
11.	<i>ba-ga-:-va</i>	<i>gu-ru-[?]</i>
12.	<i>za-ra-ka?-:</i>	
13.	<i>a-u-ra-ma</i>	
14.	<i>za-da-a-:</i>	

Though the surface is good, some cunei are blunted, others broaden in the middle, and others are not straight. One cuneus is oblong. Rounded heads on certain cunei indicate that a stylus was not used or if used was used incorrectly. There are certain incorrect signs:

Line	1	3	4	5	12	13
Incorrect Sign						
Value	<i>ša</i>	<i>?</i>	<i>u?</i>	<i>ša</i>	<i>ka?</i>	<i>u</i>
Correct Sign						

The lower middle section is the only section which is completely subject to translation (lines 11-14 center). Lines 1-3 are untranslatable. Line 4 may be read *baga : vazarka : au*, if we take *ma* as an error for *a*, and if we take what we have of the following sign as a sign for *u* such as appears in line 13 (see table). This *au* would imply a following *ramazdā*; and since this does not appear on our inscription, we might assume that this was on another brick. The occurrence of word-end signs both at the end of line 1 and at the beginning of line 2 would tend to substantiate the assumption of another brick. Line 5 reads *hya : mabišta*. Reading down the left of the two columns formed in lines 6-8, we have *bagām*, which might be either an unusual genitive plural or the regular genitive plural with two signs (*-a-na-*) omitted. In this way we can read

lines 4-8, *baga : vazarka : au[ramazdā] : hya : maθišta : bagām : .* Such a sequence occurs in the first two lines of the inscriptions of Xerxes at Van and at Elvend. Yet to do this, we must not only allow for an extraordinary number of error, but we must read first horizontally, then vertically: this is something which we find in no other Old Persian inscription.

One can hardly discuss the right hand column in lines 6-11, because of the possible connection of the signs with something on another brick. As it stands, however, it cannot be translated.

The vowel complement appears but twice in a correct use (lines 8 and 14). In OP orthography, the sign for *a* is regularly placed after a sign which has the value of a consonant plus *a* to denote *ā*; after a sign which has the value of a consonant plus *i* or *u*, the signs for *i* or *u* respectively follow, whether the vowel is long or short. Exceptions are rare, although the names of the god Mithra (*mi-θa-ra*) and of Hystaspes (*vi-ša-ta-a-sa-pa*) commonly omit the complement *i*. It is impossible, however, for the sign *i* to follow immediately a sign which includes the vowel *u*, as in lines 1 and 2. The scribe was therefore unfamiliar with OP orthographic practice.

In line 1 is a sequence *a-ra-di-za-ša-tu-ru- :*, which might seem to be a writing for the name Artaxerxes. This name appears in most OP inscriptions as *a-ra-ta-za-ša-ça-a*, but on the vase of Artaxerxes at Venice as *a-ra-đa-za-ca-ša-c(?)a*. The Babylonian writing of the name is *artakšatsu* and the Elamitic is *irtkšašša*. The writing on our tablet cannot possibly be justified.²

The inscription, therefore, consists of meaningless sequences of signs followed by meaningful sequences, the latter, however, being phrases which occur frequently in OP inscriptions. The two correct uses of the vowel complement occur in the meaningful sequences. This points to the copying of some sequences from an OP inscription — inaccurately at that — and the jotting down of random signs. The readable sequence of lines 4-8 would probably never occur except at the very beginning of an inscription (cf. Xerx. Van, Xerx. Elv., Dar. NRa, Dar. NRb, Sz.c, Dar. Elv.).

The conclusion is that the inscription is an attempt to produce something that might pass for an OP text.

ISIDORE DYEN.

University of Pennsylvania.

² Cf. A. Meillet, *Grammaire du vieux perse*² (revised by Benveniste) 64.

REVIEWS OF BOOKS

Übersetzungen aus dem Wên Hsüan. ERWIN VON ZACH. Batavia: 1935. Pp. 207.

Dr. von Zach is a well-known Austrian sinologist and a member of many learned societies, a former official of the Austrian consular service, now retired, and living in Weltewreden, Java. For a number of years he has been publishing translations of Chinese poetry and critical notes on Chinese literature. The present volume is No. 2 of his *Sinologische Beiträge*. No. 1, published in Batavia in 1930, was a study of Chinese grammar, lexicography, and translation, and included a detailed criticism of the *T'zu-yüan*.

The *Wên Hsüan* is the first anthology of Chinese literature, and was made about A. D. 530 by a prince of the house of Liang. It contains examples of thirty-six different types of literary composition by a large number of authors, including many pieces not found anywhere else. It is the most important single collection of Chinese literature, so important, that since the T'ang period there has been a school of literature which avowedly follows the *Wên Hsüan*. The modern renaissance movement in Chinese literature is directed against this school. There are a number of important commentaries on the *Wên Hsüan*, the first of which was written about A. D. 658. The text is exceedingly difficult, but the full commentaries make the meaning clear. The *Wên Hsüan* is also important in philology and phonetics because of its rhyming.

Dr. von Zach has translated about one-third of the collection, including selections from ninety-eight authors. The German is simple, clear, and concise. The poetry is printed as such, and is translated as free verse. Some of the pieces have been given explanatory introductions, and references are given when the piece has been previously translated. There are no footnotes, but there is an index of authors, some of whom are represented by as many as fifteen selections. Most of the pieces have never before been translated. Dr. von Zach is to be congratulated upon a fine and valuable piece of work. It is to be regretted that his translations of T'ang poetry are not more easily available to western students.

The Prose-Poetry of Su Tung-p'ò. CYRIL DRUMMOND LEGRAS CLARK. Shanghai: KELLY AND WALSH, 1935. Pp. xxii + 280; 2 illustrations.

This scholarly work is a credit both to the author and to the publishers. There is a foreword by Ch'ien Chung-shu which was somewhat disappointing in its vagueness. The author's introduction gives the life of Su Tung-p'ò, his philosophy of art, and the nature of the *fu*, or prose-poem. Each of these constitutes an admirable essay in itself. In describing the poet's philosophy of art, Mr. Clark gives an account of his relation to political, philosophic, and artistic movements of his day, and his debt to Buddhism and Taoism. He differs from Waley's low estimation of the poet, and while admitting that he quotes freely, maintains that his writings show real genius. In the essay on the *fu*, Mr. Clark follows Waley in deriving the form from the incantations of the ancient state of Ch'ü, and traces its history from Ch'ü Yüan through the Han, Medieval and T'ang periods to the Sung. The changes that the *fu* form has undergone at various times are also analysed. There are Chinese and "foreign" bibliographies, and an index. The full notes give the Chinese, and explain proper names, historical references, and literary allusions. These add a great deal to the scholarly value of the book, but are almost too full, since it hardly seems necessary to quote from such scholars as Klaproth and Kingsmill at this date.

A note on music on page 58 quotes the *Encyclopedia Sinica* on a point where it is almost certainly wrong. We do not know that the music of the Han period "bears distinct traces of Greek origin," because we do not know enough to say anything on the subject. All Chavannes shows is that the Pythagorean pitch pipes were probably introduced into China at that time. The fullest treatment of Chinese music is still that of Amiot, which Mr. Clark does not seem to have consulted, and the monographs of Van Aalst and Laloy are brief and inadequate. It is time that some properly prepared scholar made a thorough study of Chinese music.

The main body of the book gives translations of twenty-three *fu*, which are rendered partly in prose and partly in free verse. The prose sections seem too familiar in style and lacking in dignity. The free verse is much better, but hardly has the beauty of Waley's translations. The material of these *fu* covers a wide range, and

includes treatises on music and art, philosophic reflections, and much lyric poetry of great charm. The description of the typhoon is splendid, while the gentle melancholy of the two poems on the Red Cliff is beautiful and characteristically Chinese. But on the whole, Mr. Clark's book will be valuable for its thorough and sound scholarship, rather than for its merits as a piece of literature. As a scholarly work it deserves the highest praise, and the binding, format, and other details are up to the high standards we have come to expect from the publishers.

Le Choei-king Tchou et l'ancienne géographie Indochinoise. M.

MÉDARD. Pékin: Imprimerie des Lazaristes, 1935. xl + 67 pp., 1 pl., 3 maps.

The *Shui ching*, or *Water Classic* is the earliest treatise on the water-courses of China. A work of this name by Sang Ch'in is known to have existed at the beginning of our era, because it is quoted by Pan Ku, but the present work of that name was probably written during the Three Kingdoms Period. The first commentary on it was written by Li Tao-yüan, of the Northern Wei Period, and is of more value than the classic itself. It is the commentary with which M. Médard is concerned. A good deal of work has been done on the *Water Classic* by critical scholars of the Manchu period.

This study is limited to Indo-China. There is an introduction with critical notes by A. J. H. Charignon. The first section of the monograph deals with Chinese references to Tonkin and the province of Jenan. These are treated historically, and include references of the Han, Chin, Liu Sung, Sui, T'ang, Sung, Yüan, and Ming Periods. The next section gives the translation of the text of the *Shui ching chü* dealing with Indo-China, particularly Annam. The last section deals with intercourse with the Arabs from 844 on. There are notes and a bibliography, but no table of contents or index. Proper names are carefully identified. The first map includes Cambodia, Cochin China, Laos, and Annam; the second, gives the northern section of Annam; the third, the whole Indo-Chinese peninsula, the Malay peninsula, Sumatra, Java, and a part of Borneo.

In his *Deux Itinéraires de Chine en Inde à la fin du VIII^e siècle*, Pelliot promised that the sections of the *Shui ching chu* dealing with Annam would be translated and published. The promise, which is still awaiting fulfillment, is the point of departure for M. Médard. This monograph, then, is in the nature of a supplement to the work of Pelliot, and it is admirably conceived and executed. It needs no apology to M. Pelliot, and continues the tradition of sound studies in sinology so long maintained by the Catholic Church.

Petit Précis de Grammaire Chinoise écrite. GEORGES MARGOULIES.
Paris: MAISONNEUVE, 1934. 64 pp.

This valuable little book, edited by Adrien Maisonneuve, is a volume of the Librairie d'Amerique et d'Orient. The cover and title page are printed, but the text appears to be reproduced by some photographic process from the typed manuscript. It is too bad that the book is not published in a better form, for it is decidedly worth-while. The first twenty-five pages are devoted to a general essay on the Chinese written language. The author, after indicating differences between Chinese and European grammar, stresses three factors as essential in Chinese syntax. These are, in the order of their importance, the particles, parallelism, and rhythm. Each of these is briefly treated. Pages 26-57 are devoted to a detailed treatment of sixty-nine particles. This study of the particles is better than anything now existing in English, with the exception of Brandt's *Wenli Particles*. The treatment and grouping is somewhat different from that in Brandt. Only two particles are listed as initials, and there are groups not found in Brandt. There are also sections devoted to particles indicating the verb "to be," and to pronouns. Some of the more difficult particles, for examples 以, 者, and 所, are not treated as fully as in Brandt. There is an appendix, and an index of the particles.

The book is not one of the library of Maisonneuve Frères, and the address of the publisher is 5, Rue de Tournon, Paris VI^e. Sinologists will find this short treatise of considerable value, for while much of it has been said before, the treatment is so concise and admirable that there are few who could not read it with profit.

A Preliminary Report of the Hanchow Excavation. DAVID C. GRAHAM. Reprinted from the *Journal of the West China Border Research Society*, 1934; Vol. 6, pp. 114-31. 2 maps; profusely illustrated with photographs and drawings.

There is a group of well-informed missionaries, including J. H. Edgar, Leonard Tomkinson, and the author of this monograph, who are interested in the ethnology and prehistoric archeology of the province of Szechuan, and who organized the West China Border Research Society a number of years ago. The society publishes a journal, and centers its activity about the West China Union University, which possesses a growing Museum of Archeology, Art and Ethnology. They are probably handicapped by a lack of funds, inadequate library facilities, and the difficulty of keeping in touch with general developments and methods in their field. None of them are professional archeologists. Under these circumstances their work represents a remarkable achievement, for unless there have been very recent developments, they are the only group working in this field, not merely in Szechuan, but in the whole area of Central China.

In 1931, the Rev. V. H. Donnithorne, of Hanchow, Szechuan, heard that a farmer had accidentally discovered a number of stone and jade rings, squares, and knives. The society became interested, secured the cooperation of the Chinese authorities, and one of the results is this report.

The report is admirably done, and shows that the work has been performed with care and intelligence. The only suggestion that might be made is that more photographs be taken *in situ*, if similar opportunities occur in the future. The objects found include potsherds, which will make possible a study of ancient Szechuan pottery, stone and jade ceremonial disks, jade ceremonial knives, chisels, and swords. The artifacts are similar to those buried with the dead during the Chou period. It is probable that these finds will throw light on social and religious customs, and particular on burials. Apparently the most significant feature of the finds is their location, for they may antedate the relatively late period when written records indicate that the culture of the Yellow River Valley was diffused into the isolated province of Szechuan. These and later finds will probably show that the culture of Szechuan was much higher than the Chinese records would lead us to suspect.

Throughout the report, Laufer's *Jade* is used as an authority, and questions have been raised as to the accuracy of some of the statements in this work, which was written some time ago.

China is a field from which great results may be expected from archeological research, and the recent work of Bishop and Li Chi indicates that it is possible to secure the cooperation of the Chinese authorities. There is an increasing interest in such work among the Chinese themselves, and an increasing number of trained Chinese investigators. American museums, as funds become available, should seriously consider this field of archeological research, which offers great opportunities for valuable work.

Wang An Shih, a Chinese Statesman and Educationalist of the Sung Dynasty, Vol. I. By H. R. WILLIAMSON. London: PROBSTHAIN, 1935. x + 388 pages.

Although this study of one of the greatest of Chinese Statesmen is long overdue, it is particularly fitting, especially for Americans, that it should appear now. For the work of Wang An-shih and the opposition he aroused are similar in many ways to the present situation in the United States, and many amazing parallels occur to the reader. Indeed, it is difficult not to smile at the familiar arguments for and against the New Deal as they appear in edicts and petitions of the 11th Century. Fortunately for the Chinese, they did not possess an alphabet, or they would doubtless have referred to the Agricultural Loans Measure and the Financial Reorganization Bureau as the ALM and the FRB.

Wang An-shih (1021-86) was one of the most prominent statesmen of the Northern Sung period, and was noted as a poet, essayist, and commentator. Although the importance of his policies and a general idea of their import has been known in the west, no scientific study has been made until the present volume, which is to be the first of three. The few accounts in western languages are mentioned in the preface, with the exception of *Le prêt sur récolte institué en Chine au XI^e siècle par le ministre Wang-ngan-che* by Tcheou Houan (Paris, 1930).

Wang was a protégé of Ou-yang Hsiu, and attracted the atten-

tion of the emperor by his *Memorial of a Myriad Words* in 1058. At first he was reluctant to accept position, but under the emperor Shen Tsung (1068-86) he rose to the highest offices and practically dictated the policy of the government. China was faced with serious situations both at home and abroad. Wang attempted to meet them by sweeping reforms and new policies. He reformed the army, created an efficient militia, and engaged in successful military adventures. He depreciated the currency and lifted the embargo on the export of copper. He was opposed to the government monopolies which had existed at various times. He made government loans to farmers, and had the government take over their surplus crops. He endeavored to substitute taxes for enforced government service. He revised the educational system and the state examinations. He was thoroughly rational, and refused to pay attention to the celestial phenomena which were commonly held to indicate the will of Heaven. Unfortunately he was very stubborn, and his unwillingness to compromise or yield led to increasing opposition to his policies. Many good and able men who were more conservative refused to support him and were forced into retirement. There was considerable dishonesty by minor officials in the enforcement of his laws, and after the death of Shen Tsung his policies were reversed. The verdict of Chinese historians upon him has generally been adverse, but gradually his greatness has been more and more realized. A number of studies have recently been made by Chinese scholars, some of them since Dr. Williamson wrote his book, which tend to restore Wang's reputation.

Dr. Williamson is to be congratulated upon a splendid piece of work, and it is to be hoped that nothing will interfere with the publication of the subsequent volumes. Since there have been few western studies of Wang, Dr. Williamson has been compelled to rely upon Chinese sources. These include the *Critical Biography of Wang An-shih* written by Ts'ai Shang-hsiang in 1804, used chiefly for the account of the statesman's early life, the *Life of Wang An-shih* by the modern scholar Liang Ch'i-ch'ao, the works of Wang himself, and the Chinese histories.

Of these histories, that most frequently quoted, and on which the more important sections of the study are based, is referred to as the *T'ung Chien*. In the first reference to this work, its full

title is given as the *T'ung chien hsu pien* (p. 45), and it is said that this history was "collated by Chu Hsi." There are a number of histories containing the words *t'ung chien* in their titles, including the *T'ung chien kang mu* by Chu Hsi. But the *Hsu pien* appears to be a supplementary section to a history based on the earlier works, edited by Ch'en Jen-hsi, and written near the close of the Ming period. It is a pity that the dynastic history, while used, is not referred to more frequently, instead of secondary sources. On the other hand, Dr. Williamson is to be praised for his liberal translations of edicts, letters, and the petitions both of Wang and of his opponents. At times, translations of Wang's poems give emotional background to the narrative. The book is eminently fair, though perhaps the author has reacted a little too far from the traditional Chinese position, and may be too ready to credit Wang's own explanations of his acts. It is a minor fault that he writes personal names without hyphens; Wang An Shih and Ou Yang Hsiu instead of Wang An-shih and Ou-yang Hsiu.

In this first volume, devoted primarily to Wang's life, Dr. Williamson has performed a difficult task with distinction, and the concluding volumes will be awaited with great interest.

J. K. SHRYOCK.

Rakuro Saikyū-bo. The tomb of the Painted Basket and other two tombs of Lo-lang, being a report of the excavations in the season of 1931 carried out by the SOCIETY FOR THE STUDY OF KOREAN ANTIQUITIES. By AKIO KOIZUMI and SHUNICHI SAWA, with an English resume by Kosaku Hamada. (SOCIETY FOR THE STUDY OF KOREAN ANTIQUITIES, *Report* vol. 1.) Seoul, 1934. Pp. 196, 175 plates, 50 illus.

Since the excavation of Wang Hsü's tomb in 1925, the scientific research on the Han tombs in Lo-lang district had been temporarily suspended, but in the autumn of 1931 under the auspices of the newly founded Society for the Study of Korean Antiquities, the task was resumed on two tombs in Sekiganri and one in Nanseiri. The first two which had been plundered were not at all fruitful, but the latter yielded two wooden chambers together with an exquisite painted basket.

The tomb at Nanseiri is situated on the northern foot of a low hill, and the sepulchral mound is somewhat square-shaped. The chamber rectangular in shape is constructed with big oblong logs and is partitioned off into two rooms, main and ante rooms. The floors consist of double layers of timbers, the crosswise above and lengthwise below. The side walls of the main room are constructed with logs arranged alternately lengthwise and crosswise, while those of the ante-room are made of logs laid lengthwise only. Each room has a doorway on its north side.

Wooden chambers with inner wall of hard clay were made into reservoirs of water which trickled through from above, but in spite of the fact that all wooden and lacquered objects had been drifting about, they are in good state of preservation. The main room contained three sarcophagi, a large red lacquered and two small black lacquered ones, which probably belonged to a high officer in the district and his two consorts. Human remains in the coffins had practically disappeared and their personal belongings were not very abundant. However, in the narrow space in the chamber were found many mortuary figures, among which the especially noteworthy objects being six wooden horses in a row, their heads all pointing to the south.

The most significant find was an exquisite painted basket in the center of the ante room, from which the tomb gets the name. It is made of bamboo, 39 cm. long, 18 cm. wide, and 22 cm. high. The central sash, borders, and corner pieces are all decorated with small figures in seated position as well as lozenge and coiled dragon bands. The human figures depicted on the basket are ninety-four in all, and fortunately for us, almost all figures have names inscribed beside them. They are, like those on the stone reliefs on the Han tombs in Shantung, persons famous for their filial piety. The flesh parts of figures, reddish tint for men and creamy white for women and children, are depicted with hair-like lines, and draperies with thick and masterly strokes. The harmony and contrast of color, direction and movement of figures as well as the amazing amount of individuality which each character manifests, all prove highly developed technic in figure painting of the period. And this fact becomes more significant when we realize that the basket was a common ordinary ware of the time.

The two tombs at Sekiganri belong to the single wooden chambered type which is entered vertically from the top, while the tomb

of the Painted Basket is double chambered and the enternment had to be made from the lateral side through the entrance door. The lacquer vessels in the former two are of better quality, being all manufactured by the government factories in the capital of China, for they bear the inscription 造乘輿髮. which literally means "Lacquerers who make the Imperial palanguin." The lacquer wares in the tomb of the Painted Basket, however, are the kind of mortuary objects especially made for such purpose, hence not of first class manufacture.

As to the chronology, the authors date the Sekiganri tombs as those of the middle of the Later Han (ca. 100 A. D.) and the tomb of the Painted Basket probably to the Three Kingdoms or Two Chin (ca. 250 A. D.).

SHIO SAKANISHI.

A Papyrus Codex of the Shepherd of Hermas (Similitudes 2-9) with a Fragment of the Mandates. Edited by CAMPBELL BONNER [University of Michigan Studies, Humanistic Series, Vol. XXII]. UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN PRESS, 1934. Pp. xi + 137, Pls. V (of which four are double). \$3.00.

Of the two papyri discussed, the codex (P. Mich. 129) claims chief attention by reason of its early date in the latter half of the third century and by its considerable extent of sixty-two pages. The reading of the text and the compilation of the critical notes and introduction show such consistently careful and unhurried accuracy that one feels that human ingenuity can extract nothing further from the evidence. Not least instructive and suggestive are the effective ways in which modern aids to research have been utilised. The discussion itself covers a variety of points, of which the most significant is naturally the value of this codex in the confused problem of Hermas manuscripts. On the basis of their similarity to the codex (M), the Latin versions (L¹ L²) acquire more prestige than has sometimes been accorded to them, while in spite of its comparative sophistication A(thous) is in an estimable tradition and "alone has preserved the right reading in a goodly number of cases." The editor ranks M about on a par with S "as bases for the parts which they cover, but even here they are by no

means always to be preferred to A. . . . In short, the procedure must be eclectic." Indeed, "it is doubtful whether there ever was an authoritative text after the writer's autograph copy had perished." But while M is now fundamental to a constitution of its part of the text of *Hermas*, the present volume is not itself such a constitution. It is essentially the publication of one manuscript, with textual discussion and comparison included.

The passage from Mandates 2.6-3.1 (P. Mich. 130) is unrelated to the preceding. Though very brief, the fragment is the oldest and most primitive evidence for its text, and "exhibits many discrepancies from the other authorities, which are by no means in close accord among themselves." Its treatment here follows and corrects an earlier article by the same author in the *Harvard Theological Review* XX (1927).

The index is limited to grammatical points discussed in the notes; the plates are generous and excellently made. One should also repeat the editor's acknowledgment of the collaboration of Mr. H. C. Youtie on many points. All in all, Professor Bonner has both made a notable and important contribution to early Christian scholarship and added another distinguished member to the distinguished Michigan series.

HOWARD COMFORT.

Haverford College.

Orientalistische Studien Enno Littmann zu seinem 60. Geburtstag am 16. September 1935 überreicht von Schülern aus seiner Bonner und Tübinger Zeit. Herausgegeben von R. PARET. Leiden: E. J. BRILL, 1935. Pp. 156. Price, 7.20 guilder.

It is an exceptional tribute that these disciples have done to their master in presenting a *Festschrift* to him at the comparatively youthful age of sixty years. In addition to the deserved fame which that distinguished scholar enjoys throughout the learned world, this volume exhibits a devoted personal attitude towards their master as cherished by his students; in the words of the Preface: "Littmann hat seine Schüler wohl in die Methode wissenschaftlicher Forschung eingeführt, aber darüber hinaus hat er ihnen keinen einheitlichen Stempel aufgedrückt. Sie fühlen

sich eben dafür zu besonderem Dank verpflichtet, dass er bei aller Anteilnahme und bei aller Sorge um ihr weiteres Ergehen nie versucht hat, ihre wissenschaftliche Entwicklung auf eine bestimmte Linie und auf ein enger umgrenztes Forschungsgebiet festzulegen." The volume offers a rich variety of contents, all congenial to the master's many-sided genius; the several articles may be only briefly noticed here. H. A. Winkler's study of "Die Aleph-Beth Regel" gives a wide survey of nonsense rhymes extending all the way from the nursery and the mad-house to exorcism. The present writer notes with interest that "eenie meenie minie mo," known to him from babyhood, partly recurs in Arabic form in Cairo. The reason for the title lies in the writer's acceptance of the principle announced by Lepsius a hundred years ago for the order of the old Semitic alphabet, that it follows an unconscious polarizing arrangement. Modern philologists may well note his remark: "Ich denke, diese Leute waren Phonetiker par excellence." K. G. Kuhn discusses the still much mooted divine name YHWH; his thesis that the vocable is a plural-formation from Yau is utterly abortive both etymologically and historically. Compare Bissfeldt's contemporary solid discussion in *ZAW* 1935, 59-76. F. Horst presents an attractive literary study of the forms of Hebrew love-poetry in Canticles, e.g. the forms of admiration, comparison, description (the Arabic *wasf*), etc.; he recognizes that while the collection is late in its present form, nevertheless much old treasure survives in it (p. 43), and he concludes with a high appreciation of this Hebrew poesy, "the conventional form is handled in masterly fashion." K. H. Rengstorf discusses the conundrum of לִיקוּם in Tosefta Sukka IV, 28, and identifies it with Latin *locus*, with satisfaction to the exegesis, the word then equalling *māqôm*, surrogate for Deity, common in early Judaism, and, as he might have noted, passing over as *locus* to a Latin Father, Arnobius. There rises the question, Why such a Latinism? Was the foreign word an intentional euphemism, adopted by the learned and later forgotten by them? H. Wuthnow presents a Palmyrene mortuary bust of a lady, the text on which offers only a man's name; was there a romance? F. Stier, *Zur Komposition und Literaturkritik der Bilderreden des äthiopischen Henoch* (cc. 37-69), after a critical analysis proposes a fresh identification of sources, one "Redenquelle," and three or four "Visionsquellen."

Of great bibliographical interest for the Arabist is O. Spies's account of the manuscripts in the library of the shrine of the Imam Riza at Meshhed. A native Persian catalogue has been compiled containing nearly 4000 titles, the great majority manuscript. Under the several literary categories the writer describes the *unica* and the ancient manuscripts of importance. M. Weisweiler gives a delightful collection of "Arabische Schreibverse," i. e. the brief verses with which a writer closes his book, generally with apology to God and the reader. The oldest example of this conceit may be found in Koheleth 12:12. The editor R. Paret present an admirably thought-out plan for "a new scientific translation of the Koran," with such slight annotation and commentary as may be necessary for interpretation, much of which can be obtained by typographical means. On pp. 125 ff. he gives two examples of interest where an absolutely fresh exegesis and translation are required. E. Ruoff gives a "Contribution to the Oriental Alexander Saga." F. H. Ali (of Assiut) reveals to many a Westerner the person and poetry of Shauqi (1868-1932), "the prince of poets," as he has been entitled. The story of his European education is of interest, as is the sketch of the revival of Arabic letters in Egypt within the past hundred years. The poet is presented as a Pan-Arabist, rooted in the classic literature and history, yet fully in sympathy with the present progressive movements, interested even in the vulgar dialect; he endeavors to balance Judaism, Christianity and Islam in sympathetic, unprejudiced fashion. C. H. Rempis has succeeded in recovering seven quatrains of Avicenna, which stamp him, as the title holds, "als Vorläufer 'Omar Chajjams';" other such verses that have been ascribed to him are inauthentic, some of them indeed coming from the Persian poet. The texts with well done poetical translations are given, as also text and translation of a longer poem of Avicenna's, a *ghazal*.

J. A. MONTGOMERY.

University of Pennsylvania.

The Assyrian Laws. By G. R. DRIVER and JOHN C. MILES. OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS, 1935. Pp. xxiv + 534. \$12.00.

An adequate study of any single branch of "cuneiform law" requires today, what with the increasing mass of linguistic problems posed by the polyglot cuneiform records, and the constant readjustments in our knowledge of the underlying political, social, and economic conditions, the collaboration of the philologist and the jurist. The team of Driver and Miles signified their interest in the laws of Assyria in a joint article "Koschaker's theory of the old Assyrian Laws," which appeared in *Babyloniaca* IX. The authors have now presented us with their own exhaustive study of the entire subject. Koschaker's views are still treated with the greatest respect, and properly so; innumerable references to the publications of this distinguished and indefatigable worker testify to the profound impression which he has made. Nevertheless, the present book is by no means a mere compilation of linguistic and juristic data contributed by previous students. In addition to such digests, which are uniformly competent, the authors give us many new views and interpretations. In short the book is indispensable to all students of the ancient Orient, and particularly to those who are interested in the second millennium B. C.

The admirable restraint exercised by the authors in evaluating the available evidence enables the reader to realize clearly what is still problematic or entirely unintelligible. There is thus little to what a reviewer can take exception. One might suggest a few changes and add a reference here and there; but the ground has been covered so well that even such slight criticisms would necessitate a lengthy article for a proper presentation of our differences of opinion. I shall confine myself therefore to a few minor points.

My principal general objection concerns the authors' use of the term Middle Babylonian for documents of non-Kassite origin. To be sure, this usage follows the analogy of Middle Assyrian as opposed to Old Assyrian, which latter designation is applied also, and quite properly, to the "Cappadocian" legal documents. Moreover, in the case of the Nuzi and other Arrapha records, affinities with Babylonia rather than with Assyria cannot be denied. But such affinities are not sufficient to encourage the impression that the Nuzi records differed from the legal documents of the Ham-

murabi Dynasty primarily in a chronological sense. We have here radical contrasts of language and institutions. Such a thing, e. g., as inalienability of all real estate, which characterizes ancient Nuzi, is certainly not reflected in the code of Hammurabi. Again, a reference to the Hurrian term *manzaduhlie* as Babylonian (p. 90) is plainly incongruous. To minimize the manifold and obvious peculiarities of the legal background of Nuzi, independent of anything Babylonian in more respects than one, for the sake of a simplified terminology is scarcely helpful to the uninitiated. While there are grounds for retaining Old Assyrian for Cappadocian, there are equally valid reasons for restricting the use of Middle Babylonian and substituting Nuzi or Arrapha, and Susa, where material from the North and the East respectively is concerned.

With regard to specific details, attention may be called to the terms *tahumu* GAL and *t. TUR* (pp. 432-3; 501-2), for which a different explanation was suggested in JOURNAL 55. 439-40. The translation 'homers' (p. xxiv) is to be corrected, of course, to 'aweḥaru.' Space forbids listing other equally unimportant slips.

If the present work is well received, the authors expect to proceed to similar studies of the Code of Hammurabi and of the Hebrew laws embedded in the Pentateuch. An excellent reception is richly deserved in this case; favorable reviews may be safely predicted. It is doubtful, however, whether the book will sell as well as it should. The price has been set at \$12.00, which few of those who are principally interested will be able to afford. It is high time that scientific presses realized the importance of making basic works such as this accessible to persons with academic salaries. Although the present book contains more than 500 pages, there are in it no plates or line drawings to justify the price demanded for it. While we are grateful to the Oxford Press for sponsoring the project, we appeal to the publishers that they join with bodies like the American Oriental Society, the American Schools of Oriental Research, and others, in an effort to insure for studies of this kind the widest circulation possible by keeping down prices to a barest minimum. It would be a service to the scientific world and to the respective authors.

Prehistoric Assyria: The Excavations at Tall Arpachiyah, 1933.

By M. E. L. MALLOWAN and J. CRUIKSHANK ROSE. OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS, 1935. Pp. xv + 178 (including 78 pages of line drawings) + XXII plates (one in color). \$7.00.

This reviewer's first reaction to the book before us was one of disappointment. He expected to find in it a comprehensive presentation of facts and problems concerning the prehistory of Northern Mesopotamia. But the misleading title is rectified by the subtitle. The work deals with the results of a season of excavations on the site of Arpachiyah, near Mosul, conducted by Mr. Mallowan with the assistance of Mr. Rose, following the lead of R. Campbell Thompson who was the first to indicate the scientific promise of the mound.

A closer study of the work will soon dispel any lingering feeling of frustration. The book deals with an unusually productive mound whose latest deposits antedate the end of the Chalcolithic Age. The work is competent throughout, and the drawings and illustrations are uniformly excellent. Moreover, the material is rich and varied. Brief references to foreign relations facilitate the reader's speedy orientation as to the comparative significance of the finds discussed. There is a complete index to figures and catalogue objects, but one misses an analytical table of contents; the reader will experience some difficulty in finding the passages that he wishes to re-read; and many of them are distinctly worth re-reading.

On p. 25 there is a table of correspondences on different prehistoric sites. The uppermost deposits of Arpachiyah are shown to coincide with the Uruk period. Below these appear in succession products relating to Tell Halaf, Samarra, and the earliest painted pottery antedating el-Obeid I and apparently related to the wares of Neolithic Iran. Pottery is clearly the principal yield of the site, which now becomes one of the best sources for the study of prehistoric ceramics. The greater antiquity of the Tell Halaf and Samarra analogues as against those of later el-Obeid, already foreshadowed by Mallowan's work at Nineveh and the reviewer's observations at Tepe Gawra, is amply confirmed at Arpachiyah.

Apart from pottery, amulets deserve special mention owing to their wealth and variety. Architectural features are few, but one

of them is of outstanding significance. It is the type of building with circular foundations, represented here by ten examples. The reconstructions are based on the assumption, which is manifestly sound, that we have here an unexpectedly early prototype of the Mediterranean tholos, dating as it does from the Tell Halaf period. It would follow that dome construction in Mesopotamia goes back to early prehistoric times. A partial analogue may be found in the barrel vault of Gawra VIII. Latest reports from Tepe Gawra indicate the discovery of an extensive "Round House" containing 17 rooms, from a level belonging to the very beginning of the Uruk period.¹ We have here thus a more ambitious counterpart of the tholos, at least in so far as the ground plan is concerned.

The book is plainly indispensable to all students of Mesopotamian archaeology. The authors, and the British School of Archaeology which financed the expedition, deserve our warmest congratulations.

E. A. SPEISER.

University of Pennsylvania.

¹ Cf. *Excavations at Tepe Gawra* (1935) 36, and for the "Round House" see *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, April, 1936.

NOTES OF THE SOCIETY

The next issue of the *Journal* is to be a memorial to Professor Breasted. Dr. A. C. Woolner, Vice-Chancellor of the Panjab University, and member of the Society since 1921, died January 7, 1936.

The next two volumes of the American Oriental Series, now in press, are to be: Vol. 8, *A Grammar of Phoenician*, by Zellig S. Harris; Vol. 9, *The Kashmirian Atharva Veda, Books 16 and 17*, by LeRoy C. Barrett.

The Executive Committee has elected the following persons as corporate members of the SOCIETY.

George Dahl
Kate B. George
George Kennedy
Frederick Lent
W. B. McLaughlin
R. M. Montgomery
Ruth Nelson

Robert K. Reischauer
D. H. Rowe
H. S. Santesson
E. C. Shedd
Earl Swisher
Elsie Ward
J. W. Ward

The Librarian has received a request for a complete set of the *Journal*, volumes 1-53 inclusive, for which the sum of \$180 to \$200 is offered.

The Committee for the Promotion of Oriental Research reports the following actions.

At the request of the Semitic Conference of the Society the Committee appointed a subcommittee of American Assyriologists to confer with similar committees in Europe on the devising of a uniform system of transliterating cuneiform script. The subcommittee so appointed, consisting of Professors Meek (chairman), Albright, Olmstead, Pfeiffer, Poebel, Speiser, Stephens, and Waterman, has reported progress in the face of many difficulties.

The Committee recommended to the American Academy of Arts and Sciences the publication of a paleographic album of Syriac manuscripts, by Professor Hatch.

Support was given to the application of Dr. Helen M. Johnson to the American Council of Learned Societies for assistance in the translation, with notes, etc., of an important Jain work written in Sanskrit by Hemacandra. This project has been put in the preferred class by the Council.

Active assistance was given to the securing of scholarly approval and financial support for the study which Dr. M. B. Emeneau is now making in India of the Munda and Dravidian languages.

The Committee assisted in obtaining backing and funds for the excavations which are proceeding at Chanhudaro, in the Indus Valley, under the direction of Mr. Ernest Mackay. This promising enterprise, which has been approved by the Indian government, is under the administration of the American School of Indic and Iranian Studies, and the Boston Museum of Fine Arts, which is financing it.

The Committee proposed to the American Philosophical Society the awarding of a grant to enable Mr. Percy Buchanan to study in the field the possible origins of certain Japanese grammatical phenomena in Outer Mongolia. The application was granted.

Endorsement was given to the American Council of Learned Societies in behalf of a project, to be directed by Professor Speiser, for an archaeological reconnaissance of northwestern Persia.


For all of these projects the Committee made every possible effort to secure support. Members of the Society who have well planned projects or completed manuscripts are invited to submit them to the Committee. Such communications should be addressed to Professor Harold H. Bender, Princeton University.

NOTES OF OTHER SOCIETIES

The New Orient Society has received severe blows through the deaths of Dr. Laufer and, more recently, of Professor Breasted. In spite of this, it intends to continue its activities, and has recently published a pamphlet under the title *The New Orient*. It contains an appreciation of Breasted by Professor Olmstead, and four other articles.

The Fourth International Congress of Linguists will meet at the University of Copenhagen, August 27 to September 1, 1936. The president will be Professor Otto Jespersen. For information address the General Secretary, M. Viggo Brøndal, Nørregade 6, Copenhagen.

The University of Madras is preparing a complete up-to-date catalogus catalogorum of Sanskrit manuscripts, to be published by the University of Madras, under the editorship of Mahamahopadhyaya Prof. S. Kuppuswami Sastri, M. A., Professor of Sanskrit and Comparative Philology, Presidency College, Madras (on leave), and Curator, Government Oriental Manuscripts Library, Madras—(Editor-in-Chief); Professor P. P. S. Sastri, M. A. (Oxon.), Officiating Professor of Sanskrit and Comparative Philology, Presidency College, Madras; and Dr. C. Kunhan Raja, B. A. (Hons.), D. Phil. (Oxon.). Reader in Sanskrit, University of Madras.



JAMES HENRY BREASTED
1865-1935

15 AUG 1938

JAMES HENRY BREASTED

1865-1935

JAMES HENRY BREASTED was essentially American in background, habit of mind, and point of view. Much of his mature life was spent in Europe and the Near East and in travel to and from those regions, but his cosmopolitan experience did not alter his fundamentally pragmatic attitude. His interest in man and man's behavior to-day and throughout what he was fond of calling "the career of man" was of the keenest, while his appreciation of human nature as he found it in man of to-day or yesterday was one of his most endearing characteristics. And it was this sympathy, together with his great imaginative powers and sound scholarship, that enabled him to write history in a style which won and held the layman as well as the scholar and specialist.

Breasted was born August 27, 1865 in Rockford, Illinois, at that time a town of about 8,000 inhabitants, where his father was a hardware merchant. His ancestors, who were of English and Netherland stock, had lived on this continent for more than two hundred years. The family name was originally Van Breestede. Young Breasted attended North Western College (now North Central College) at Naperville, Illinois, and took his B. A. there in 1888. In the long vacations while at college, and later at the seminary, he worked at various occupations, including banking and pharmacy, and he became a registered pharmacist. The family life was wholesome and tinged by a strong religious feeling, and it was not surprising that an energetic young man of great strength of character should have thought of the ministry as a career, and that this idea should have been encouraged by his family and friends. In that time and region it was natural for the religious atmosphere to be somewhat "fundamentalist," and it is quite understandable that when Breasted's belief in the literal inerrancy of the Hebrew scriptures was shaken, though by his own theological professors, he gave up his intention of being a Congregational minister. However, at the Chicago Theological Seminary, Breasted had become greatly interested in the Hebrew language and in the ancient history of the Near East, and he determined to continue his studies in those fields. He went to the Graduate School of Yale University, where he took

his M. A. in 1892. His instructor, W. R. Harper, was then revolutionizing the teaching of Hebrew; his three text-books for the elementary study of that language had gone through numerous editions during the 1880's. While Breasted was at Yale Harper accepted the invitation to become the first president of a revived University of Chicago, and keenly aware of Breasted's abilities and desiring to broaden his future Department of Semitic Languages at Chicago, he urged his pupil to study Egyptian at Berlin under Erman, father of the modern scientific study of that ancient language. Breasted took his M. A. at Yale with high honors, having actually passed the equivalent of the doctor's examination, but not having completed the residence requirements for that degree. He proceeded to his doctorate at Berlin, presenting as his thesis an edition of the sun-hymns of the El 'Amärneh period, and not long afterwards he became a member of the faculty of the University of Chicago, where he was to remain for the rest of his life. He was soon drawn into the work of the great Egyptian dictionary which was being compiled by the German Academies under the direction of Erman at Berlin. In 1900 and 1901 he copied inscriptions for the dictionary in many European museums and made two exploratory and recording campaigns in Egypt and Nubia in 1905-1907 as Director of his first expedition for Chicago. He returned to Egypt in 1908 and copied for the Berlin dictionary the inscriptions of the temple at Abu Simbel in Nubia. Later he helped translate and edit for the dictionary inscriptions of the Middle Kingdom.

Although he spent many years reading hieroglyphic, hieratic, and Coptic texts with his students and making careful studies of historical and other texts, his deepest interest was always to re-create the great civilizations of the ancient Near East and especially Egypt. He early undertook the prodigious task of copying or collating and then translating all the Egyptian texts of historical importance from the beginning down to the Persian conquest of Egypt in 525 B. C., a period of more than two millennia and a half. In the years during which he was preparing the volumes of the *Ancient Records of Egypt*, Breasted had constantly with him on his travels between Chicago and Egypt or various European cities a large old-fashioned "telescope" bag for his manuscript, and a box containing his travelling library. Meanwhile the *History of Egypt* was also taking form as the goal of Breasted's study of the historical inscriptions. He felt that the better

understanding of long-known inscriptions required the restatement of certain episodes in Egyptian history, while at the same time constant fresh discoveries made advisable the publication of new facts for students of history who were unable to use the original documents. Moreover, he believed that now the subject could be presented more significantly than as a mere catalogue of available facts. With the eye of his imagination Breasted could reconstruct the ancient Egyptian scene, as any of his colleagues who have been his companions on the Nile can testify. One of his former pupils remembers, with a thrill, standing with him above Deir el Bahri on the great cliff overlooking the Theban plain while he re-created the teeming life of the Egyptian capital. He pictured just such a day in the time of the New Kingdom, when the great state barge of Amūn was towed up-stream from Karnak that the god might make his yearly visit to his temple of Luxor. Breasted loved his ancient Egyptians, and was perhaps just a trifle jealous for them. He did not go out of his way to welcome suggestions that civilization may have arisen earlier in Mesopotamia than on the Nile. He usually felt that these views were not supported by compelling evidence. But in a man of his thorough scholarship and proved soundness of judgment this attitude can only be considered a very slight and amiable bias. As with every true scholar his fundamental aim was the search for truth wherever it might lead.

The *History of Egypt* appeared in print before the *Ancient Records*. When it was issued in 1905 it was hailed at once as a monument of sound learning and as an extraordinarily clear and logical presentation of the story of an ancient civilization. It was in this latter quality particularly that the book excelled. The works of one or two other great historians of Egypt show equally sound scholarship, but their chronicles have not the vision and enthusiasm of Breasted's. The *History* has held its own unchallenged. It has been reprinted numerous times, has been translated into German, Russian, French, and Arabic, and has been reproduced in Braille for the benefit of blind students. In this book Breasted brings the story of Egypt down to the conquest by Persia in 525 B. C. He was much less interested in the Persian and Graeco-Roman periods, for the free development of the native genius of Egypt had practically ended with the fall of the XXVI Dynasty.

The four volumes of the *Ancient Records of Egypt* appeared in

1906-07 and constitute one of the principal monuments to his scholarship and tremendous energy and industry. A fifth volume contains full indexes prepared by his pupils. The locus of each of the many hundred monuments dealt with is given by the author, as well as full references to all publications in whole or in part, so that scholars are able to control the translations by recourse to the originals or the publications. There are also copious notes and transliterations of numerous proper names and other words and phrases.

Breasted's early studies of the 'Amārneh hymns together with necessary work in preparation for his history had interested him in the development of Egyptian religion. In 1908 and 1910 appeared the text volumes, in autograph, of Kurt Sethe's great edition of the Pyramid Texts of the V and VI Dynasties, containing copies of the hieroglyphic text of these earliest Egyptian religious inscriptions, many of which reflected the thought of an age much older than that of the inscriptions themselves. Breasted restudied these, read portions of them with his students, and became interested in comparing the beliefs and ideas to be found there with those of later periods of Egyptian history. Therefore when he was invited to deliver the Morse lectures at the Union Theological Seminary in New York he chose Egyptian religion as his subject and the lectures were published in 1912 as *The Development of Religion and Thought in Ancient Egypt*. Twenty years later he returned to this subject in his *Dawn of Conscience*, published in 1933. In the later book he was concerned with demonstrating the comparative newness of the "Age of Character" as contrasted with the "Age of Weapons" and also with presenting evidence for the influence of Egyptian moral and social ideals on the authors of the Hebrew Scriptures, while he was able to base his conclusions upon the fruits of his own and others' researches during the twenty years since the publication of his earlier work.

Breasted was not content with telling the story of Egypt. He was intensely concerned with the idea of bringing home to the modern western world its debt to the great civilizations of the ancient Near East. He often said that, much as he admired the marvellous contributions of Greece to art and philosophy, he was weary of the prevalent belief among educated laymen that "everything began with the Greeks." A somewhat sneering allusion to

Egyptian art published by an eminent classical colleague of his was frequently mentioned by him, with a snort of disgust, as an example of the evil effects of ignorance. He determined to write a text-book for use in secondary schools and colleges, describing the rise and development of the ancient cultures, including those of Greece and Rome. The result of this determination was the publication in 1916 of that remarkable book *Ancient Times: A History of the Early World*, in which Breasted, beginning with palaeolithic man, brought the story of civilization down to the fall of Rome. For many years he had been giving a course at the University of Chicago on the ancient history of the Near East and had through his colleagues kept himself abreast of discoveries in the Mesopotamian field as well as in the Egyptian. This course was meant for more advanced undergraduates at the University and was well attended by them, but the lectures were also regularly attended by graduate students of Semitics, and these latter were occasionally startled by being called upon by the lecturer to translate inscriptional material which was being used to illustrate some point. The book *Ancient Times* has been widely used throughout the world and has undoubtedly done more than any other single work to propagate a general knowledge of the debt of modern civilization to the ancient Near East. It has been translated into Swedish and Arabic and in an abridged edition into Japanese and Malay. Another version of the book, published a few years ago as *The Conquest of Civilization*, has been translated into Spanish. The book is copiously illustrated and Breasted gave much thought to this feature of his exposition. When a second edition was needed, he took care that the text was brought up to date and new illustrative material added. The new edition appeared in 1935 and was the last of his works to be published during his lifetime.

Breasted was married in Berlin, soon after taking his doctorate in 1894, to Frances Hart, a compatriot, who with her sisters was studying music and German there. They went to Egypt on their wedding journey and she was his almost constant companion on his trips to Egypt or to Europe for twenty-five years, until serious illness began to make it difficult for her to travel. A few years after her death Breasted's friends were glad to learn of his marriage to her sister.

President Harper had made good his offer of a post on the Chicago faculty, but the early years there were full of difficulty and struggle for Breasted. He was the first scholar appointed to the faculty of any American university for the purpose of teaching in the field of Egyptology, and his subject was considered a decided luxury. W. Max Müller, born three years before Breasted and also a brilliant pupil of Erman's, had been in Philadelphia since 1890, but he was teaching Hebrew and Greek at a theological seminary and so far as we know gave no formal instruction in Egyptian until many years later. Breasted's stipend was pitifully small and to support himself and his family he was obliged to give popular lectures wherever and whenever opportunity offered. The frequent journeys exhausted him and they also consumed much valuable time, but they trained him in clear interesting exposition, the basis for his amazing later success in popularization. Fortunately President Harper appreciated him and gave him leaves of absence to work for the Berlin dictionary in the museums of Europe. Here it was that Breasted laid the basis for his work on the historical inscriptions and on the *History* itself. Financial stringency was relieved as promotion came steadily, and with the publication of the *History* in 1905 he attained a full professorship and the recognition which he had already received among his European colleagues.

Breasted had a youthful zest for life. His temper was sanguine and optimistic rather than otherwise. His habit of constant hard work left him little opportunity for diversions but when he was free for a short time from the pressure of duty he took great delight in music, the theatre, and in conversation on a wide variety of subjects. He had a mellow and pleasing tenor voice which he had too little opportunity to use. He had not much time after his early youth for outdoor sports nor the money to spend on them, but he had ridden as a young man and occasionally rode later, though these instances were chiefly exploratory journeys in Egypt or Mesopotamia. He had a well-knit figure, a trifle under middle height, with the sloping shoulders and slightly bowed legs that often go with strong and active bodies. His abstemious diet and regular habits kept him in excellent health for the most part, but his long hours of work and the increasingly heavy load of responsibility that he carried, from time to time produced attacks of nervous indigestion. He was high-strung, but his nerves were under remarkable control.

His hair turned white at an early age, and his magnificent head was famous. His appearance changed little in the last thirty years of his life. His firm jaw and erect carriage bespoke the man of resolution and action, but his eye was the eye of a poet and philosopher.

Few men in the world of scholarship, it seems to us, can have lived to see their dreams come true and their visions reach fulfilment to such an extent as did Breasted. From the time when he first visited the tombs at El 'Amārneh on his wedding journey and found that marauders had only lately sadly damaged the text of one of the beautiful sun-hymns which had formed the subject of his doctoral dissertation, he had felt most keenly the necessity of recording accurately the inscriptions of the known monuments of Egypt before they were irrevocably ruined by vandalism or exposure to the weather. Many were altogether unpublished and many others had been published inadequately or so long ago that the record had little value for modern scholarship. To learn the story of "the career of man" the known records must be preserved for study and new records must be discovered. Breasted had long dreamed of an organization which might play a large part in following out these aims, and immediately after the Great War he succeeded in enlisting the active support of Mr. John D. Rockefeller, Jr. While a beginning was made on the great Assyrian dictionary at Chicago, Breasted headed an expedition of reconnaissance to Egypt, Mesopotamia, Syria, and Palestine in 1920. He then came home and laid his plans. A corpus was to be made of one of the great classes of Egyptian religious literature—the Middle Kingdom Coffin Texts. The first great volume of this corpus was in the press when Breasted died. The inscriptions of the more important temples of Egypt were to be copied. Three great volumes on those of Medinet Habu had appeared; two on the Karnak inscriptions were in the press. A geological expedition had surveyed the remains of prehistoric man in Egypt and published three volumes. Another expedition was recording Old Kingdom tombs at Sakkāreh. Another, with the collaboration of the Egypt Exploration Society of England, was doing a similar work at the great temple at Abydos. In Palestine the huge mound of Megiddo had been excavated for several seasons and in the mountains of Anatolia a six-year dig at the mound of Alishar had been completed. Extensive excavations had also taken

place or were in progress at Khorsabād, Tell Asmar, and at Khafaje in 'Irāq, at Persepolis in Irān, and at Chatal Hüyük and el Judeydeh in North Syria. From them was passing a constant stream of information in varying forms to the great new Oriental Institute building at Chicago where it constantly increased the materials gathered there for the study of ancient man. Breasted was the center of all this, as he had been the planner of it all.

In spite of his multifarious executive concerns Breasted did not abandon scholarly work. In the period following the war he prepared and brought out (1930) his two-volume critical edition of the famous papyrus of the New York Historical Society, *The Edwin Smith Surgical Papyrus*. In these latter years he received many honors: honorary doctorates from the Universities of California, Oxford, and Princeton; honorary membership in foreign learned societies; the presidency of the American Historical Association and of our own SOCIETY.

He had labored fruitfully and he saw the magnificent results of his labors. He richly earned his rewards and satisfactions. When death came he was mercifully and quickly struck down in the fullness of his powers. He was a great scholar, a great American, a great and very human personality.

His colleagues and fellow-members of the American Oriental Society will long feel keenly the loss of his inspiring and genial personality, while they will always take pride in his accomplishments and in the recognition of them both at home and abroad. Much of his work must endure for many years with only those modifications and supplements required by the progress of our knowledge of the ancient Near East, while the foundation he has laid for the study of the rise of civilization should last as long as man continues to take an interest in his beginnings.

LUDLOW BULL

EPHRAIM A. SPEISER

ALBERT TEN EYCK OLMSTEAD

for the SOCIETY.

HOW WELL CAN WE KNOW THE ANCIENT NEAR EAST? *

W. F. ALBRIGHT

THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY

THE STUDY of the ancient Near East stands on the frontier of humanistic research, since it is perhaps the most difficult branch of learning to justify on obvious utilitarian grounds. Not only does it belong to a remote and now relatively unimportant part of the earth, but it appertains to a time which is called "the past past" in the current jargon of a certain group of thinkers. It is not strange that students of the Ancient Orient must often be asked to give reason for their faith in the value of their chosen field of investigation. Nor is it remarkable that attacks on this field become more frequent as its absolute importance grows. In some places the unprecedented expansion of ancient oriental studies during the past half-century has led to their being given a somewhat factitious academic place, as in Germany before 1933, with the natural result that the representatives of other disciplines rebel against the apparent lack of proportion.

The brilliant career of the late James Henry Breasted has now made America the focus of interest in the recovery of the Ancient Orient. With the rapid decline of attention to our studies in the German universities since 1933, America is in process of becoming the academic center of research in this field. Our leading universities have recognized its importance by establishing departments in which it receives attention. Our museums are fast leaving the universities behind, with the notable exception of the University of Chicago. However, all this interest is somewhat artificial, since it rests too exclusively on the organizing ability of a very few enthusiastic scholars, and not on a spontaneous academic demand. It behooves us, accordingly, to inspect our defences, in order that we may not be caught napping by an onslaught from an unexpected direction. We are always surrounded by real or potential foes who think that they can use our modest income to balance some tiny deficit in their budgets.

* Presidential address, delivered at the annual meeting of the Society, in New Haven, April 15, 1936.

One of the most recent onslaughts on our position has been made by the German classical historian of the University of Leipzig, Helmuth Berve, known for two large works in the field of Greek and Hellenistic history.¹ His attack, which is only a symptom of a widespread attitude in Germany, appeared a little over a year ago in Walter Goetz's *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte*. In this paper, entitled "Zur Kulturgeschichte des Alten Orients," Berve describes the present state of this research, as illustrated by the work of Kees, Götze, and Christensen, praises the brilliant synthesis produced by these scholars, and maintains that with the appearance of their publications the field has been exhausted, so far as its utility for the general historian is concerned. "The *Kulturgeschichte des Alten Orients* is by no means superfluous or without significance. On the contrary, it is epochal in its importance, precisely because it stands at the end of the positivistic age, whose tremendous work it synthetizes in splendid fashion. . . . It stands at the boundary (of the two ages) as a proud monument of German scholarly investigation. . . ." ²

Why does Berve declare that the field now ceases to have any value as a subject of academic research? He writes: "The science of the Ancient Orient is condemned to inactivity at the moment when the formulation of intellectual problems passes beyond the domain in which facts may be established by reason, in so far as it is concerned with peoples of another race, of another nature, which are, therefore, incomprehensible (to us) in the depths of their individuality. This science thus fails to measure up to the requirements of the new standard of values, and consequently loses its right to exist. For the requirements of the new standard of values have become inexorably real for the historical sciences, at least within the realm of German intellectual spirit."³ Again he says: "Without a definite, universally binding evaluation, it is impossible to carry on productive investigation. This is not only an irresistible deduction from our present cultural or political situation, which denies the right of existence to a science without (our) standard of values, but it is also an inner necessity of science itself, which is

¹ *Das Alexanderreich auf prosopographischer Grundlage*, 2 vols., 1926; *Griechische Geschichte*, 2 vols., 1931-3.

² *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte*, 25. 230.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 229, below.

beginning to find its way back to the instinctive judgment expressed by Traitschke in the beautiful words, 'Man can only understand what he loves'."⁴ Berve then proceeds to assert that one cannot understand the exotic, uncanny life of the Ancient Orient, and that accordingly one cannot love it. Q. E. D.

It is not necessary for us to dwell at length on the further discussion of the subject by Berve. As might be expected, it pivots on the dogma of the *Rassengedanke*, and the author quotes with approval the views of Ludwig Ferdinand Clauss, *Die nordische Seele*. For Anglo-Saxons, whose sober realism revolts against the metaphysical subtleties of racist psychology, and above all, for Americans, proud of the many racial and national strains which have gone into the formation of our synthetic people, it is impossible to love these romantic unrealities, though we may claim to understand them, just as we may try to comprehend quantum physics. But Berve has made it necessary for the Orientalist who would be an impartial thinker to take stock and to justify his labor to himself, as well as to others.

First we shall make a rapid survey of the progress achieved hitherto in the recovery of the Ancient Orient, in all spheres of investigation. Then we shall compare the methods employed in our field with those used in other comparable fields. Thirdly, we shall frankly ask ourselves, What is the utility of our studies? Finally, we shall contrast the nihilism of a Berve with the buoyant optimism of a Breasted.

A century ago almost nothing was known about the ancient Orient, outside of the information to be secured from the Bible and from a few fragmentary Greek sources. In 1836 Champollion's posthumous grammar of Egyptian was just beginning to appear in print, thus closing the period of stagnation that set in after the great decipherer's death. Wilkinson was about to publish the first serious attempt to gather the rich pictorial material from Egyptian tombs and temple-walls together in a description of ancient Egyptian life. Hincks and Lepsius were just beginning the researches which later transformed Egyptology into a respectable young science. Cuneiform studies were still in their swaddling clothes; Grotefend's first essays at the decipherment of Persian had been finally published, but were still regarded with skepticism by the

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 227.

few who knew of them; Burnouf's important treatise, in which sound philological method was first employed, was just about to appear. Nothing whatever was yet known about Assyrian; Gesenius and Rödiger had not yet published the results of their studies in the Phoenician and South Arabian inscriptions; hardly any other of the many scripts and languages now known had even been discovered. The state of field and comparative archaeology was worse, since no one had even made a beginning in these disciplines, now of so great importance.

During the half-century from 1836 to 1886, the foundations of our knowledge of the Ancient Orient were solidly laid. Egyptology was developed by a remarkable little group of men, led by scholars of the caliber of Lepsius and Brugsch, Birch and Goodwin, de Rougé and Chabas. Lepsius' colossal publication, *Denkmäler aus Aegypten und Nubien* (1849-56) provided a mass of reliable monumental material for study, and Brugsch's *Hieroglyphisch-demonisches Wörterbuch* (1867-8, 1880-2) gave an elaborate collection of words and meanings, which was not to be superseded for over half a century. But at the end of the period in question there was still no clear idea of the grammatical structure of Egyptian, and the only grammar with any claim to scientific method was Erman's *Neuägyptische Grammatik* (1880). In 1850 Mariette began his long career as excavator, but his undertakings were nearly always conducted in his absence by natives, and never rose beyond the category of archaeological treasure-hunts, however great their value as pioneer work under difficult conditions may have been. It was not until the end of 1884 that Flinders Petrie began excavating at Naucratis, where he laid the foundations of a new excavating technique. In the field of Assyriology even more spectacular successes were achieved. The decipherment of Old Persian was completed with the publication of Rawlinson's edition of the great Behistun inscription in 1846. The Assyrian enigma proved harder to unravel, but yielded to the onslaughts of Hincks, Rawlinson, and others, between 1846 and 1855. By the latter year general agreement was reached by the cuneiformists, but it was over twenty years before all competent Semitists were convinced that cuneiform had been successfully deciphered. This failure to be convinced was naturally due to the lack of strict philological method on the part of cuneiform scholars like George Smith and Jules Oppert. It was not until the German school of Assyriology was founded by Schra-

der in 1872, and developed by Friedrich Delitzsch (1874—) and his pupils, especially Haupt (1879—), Zimmern (1885—), and Jensen (1885—), that rigid linguistic and philological methods were employed. But at the end of our period there was still no proper grammar or dictionary of Assyrian. Mesopotamian excavation, thanks to the devoted efforts of men like Botta, Layard, Place, and de Sarzec, was definitely on a plane above that of Egyptian excavation, though still primitive when measured by present-day methods. The interpretation of West-Semitic inscriptions, brilliantly inaugurated at the opening of our period by Gesenius, reached a high-water level with Schröder's *Die phönizische Sprache* (1869), and continued to develop, thanks to the work of Renan, Clermont-Ganneau, and others. The state of archaeological research remained exceedingly low in Syria and Palestine, however, though Clermont-Ganneau and de Vogüé laid solid foundations, and though an invaluable archaeological survey was undertaken by the English Palestine Exploration Fund. In Asia Minor the Hittite inscriptions had been identified and partly collected (Sayce, 1877—); Schliemann (1870—) had begun stratigraphical excavation with his work at Troy. But neither scientific philology nor scientific archaeology, as we understand these disciplines today, had come into the scene yet, though both had already appeared on the horizon.

The past fifty years have been a period of increasingly intensive research, and of the most extraordinary expansion in our knowledge of the Ancient Orient, in every possible direction. Let us first consider the advance made in the field of linguistics and philology, and then we may turn to examine the state of the new disciplines, systematic excavating technique and comparative archaeology.

It was at the very outset of the latest period that a solid foundation for the knowledge of Egyptian and Accadian (of which Assyrian is only a dialect) was laid by Erman, Sethe, Steindorff, and Delitzsch. In the Egyptian field three grammatical works of the highest importance were published: Erman's *Die Sprache des Papyrus Westcar* (1889), *Aegyptische Grammatik* (1894), and Sethe's great work, *Das ägyptische Verbum* (1899-1902). Together with Steindorff's work on the laws of Coptic vocalization, these works transformed the vague conception of Egyptian grammar which had been cherished by all scholars into a well-knit

structure. Egyptologists like Naville, Renouf, and even Maspero rejected most of the "Berlin grammar" to the end of their life; now, of course, there is not a single competent Egyptologist left who does not accept it fully. In 1897 Erman began to collect material for a complete Egyptian dictionary, which is now in process of publication (since 1925); since all words and meanings are now available, in five large volumes, the fact that publication of the references has hardly begun, is not so serious. Gunn (*Studies in Egyptian Syntax*, 1923) and Gardiner (*Egyptian Grammar*, 1927) have progressed notably beyond the stage reached by Erman and Sethe, while Erman himself, in his *Neuägyptische Grammatik* (second edition, entirely rewritten, 1933) has brought the important language of the New Empire into linguistic shelter. Even the vexed problem of vocalization, particularly difficult in a script where only consonants are written as a rule, is now being solved (Sethe, Albright, 1923—). We stand just before a period of remarkable activity in the field of comparative Hamito-Semitic research, which will undoubtedly contribute much to our understanding of the evolution of the Egyptian language, as well as of the relations between Egypt and Asia.

In the cuneiform field we can chronicle equal progress. Delitzsch's three books, *Assyrisches Wörterbuch* (1887—), *Assyrische Grammatik* (1889), and *Assyrisches Handwörterbuch* (1897), based mainly on his own and Haupt's work, have proved to be an even more solid foundation for Accadian than Erman's were for Egyptian, owing again to the disadvantage at which the latter was placed by the absence of vocalization in Egyptian. The field has grown more and more complex, because of the constantly increasing mass of published cuneiform inscriptions from every historical period and from every country in Western Asia. Thanks especially to the efforts of Zimmern, Ungnad, Landsberger, and Lewy, together with their pupils, especially von Soden, our knowledge of Accadian is now remarkably exact, and a relatively complete historical grammar can be written in which the phonetic, morphological, and syntactic peculiarities of Babylonian and Assyrian can be traced for about 2500 and 1500 years, respectively, while much can be said about local dialects. Owing to the progress of comparative Semitic grammar in the hands of Barth, Brockelmann, and many others, it is possible to trace the evolution of Accadian through a period of perhaps four millennia. The lexicographical

studies of Meissner, Landsberger, Bezold, and others have vastly enriched Accadian lexicography, while the work on the Chicago Assyrian Dictionary, under the direction of Poebel, will before long provide an invaluable tool for research in this field. It is surprising how few passages in Accadian literature still defy interpretation. Owing to the wealth of material available, the prospect of rapid progress in clearing away the remaining obscurities and uncertainties is much brighter in Accadian than in Egyptian.

When we turn to the remaining scripts and languages of the ancient Near East, it is impossible not to be surprised by the uninterrupted discovery of new scripts as well as new languages. The day of diminishing returns has not dawned; every year or two seems to yield at least one new script, and the number of new languages and dialects increases by geometric progression. Hittite cuneiform has been deciphered, and Hittite may now be read better than Accadian was fifty years ago. Thanks to Hrozný (1915—), Forrer, Friedrich, Götze, Sommer, Sturtevant, and others, our knowledge of Hittite grammar and lexicography is as solidly established as that of Accadian then was, though perhaps not so complete. But with the publication of the Boğazköy texts, numerous other tongues have become accessible to the investigator, including Luwian and Hurrian. The latter has become particularly important, owing to the decipherment of the Ugarit alphabet, in which a number of Hurrian texts are found, and to the publication of the tablets from the Kirkūk region, which are full of Hurrian names and words. The Hurrian field is now being opened up rapidly, owing to the work of Messerschmidt, Bork, Ungnad, Forrer, Thureau-Dangin, Friedrich, and Speiser, to mention the men who have worked most effectively here. Its potential importance is very great. Closely related to Hittite and Luwian is the tongue of the Hittite hieroglyphic texts, which long defied decipherment, but has recently been attacked with marked success by Meriggi (1928—), Forrer, Gelb, Bossert, and Hrozný. However, a great deal remains to be done before convincing translations can be offered. We have no room here to speak of the progress made in the study of Lycian, Lydian, Vannic, etc., in which domains Friedrich is easily the ablest of the men now at work. Nor can we speak of Elamite in detail, but it must be observed that the discovery at Persepolis of many thousands of documents written in Neo-Susian will provide a mine of material for future in-

vestigators. Among the most active investigators in this field in recent years we may mention Hüsing and now Poebel.

The most interesting and difficult of all the languages written in cuneiform is undoubtedly Sumerian, a tongue which was already dead before 2000 B. C., though it was cultivated in Babylonian priestly circles down to the Christian era and perhaps even beyond. For decades there were able scholars who denied its existence as a real speech, maintaining that it was an artificial creation of the priests. It is now a generation since any competent student has held this view, which seems absurd in the light of our present knowledge. Thanks especially to the work of Thureau-Dangin, Langdon, Delitzsch, Deimel, and Poebel, whose *Sumerische Grammatik* (1923) was epoch-making, we now possess a very good knowledge of Sumerian.* In Delitzsch's *Sumerisches Glossar* and Deimel's *Sumerisches Lexikon* we possess useful dictionaries, though the number of workers in this field is too small for rapid progress. However, the importance of Sumerian is undoubtedly growing steadily, and new workers are certain to be attracted to so interesting and productive a field.

If we turn to the Semitic alphabetic scripts and the inscriptions written in them, we shall also note unprecedented progress. First came the discoveries of very early Canaanite (Hebrew) and Aramaic inscriptions at Sham'al (Zinjirli) in northern Syria (1888—). In 1923 the discovery of the sarcophagus of Aḥrâm, king of Byblus, carried the antiquity of the Phoenician alphabet back to the twelfth or thirteenth century B. C., and nearly every year since then has witnessed the finding of additional evidence for the antiquity of the alphabet. Gardiner's partial decipherment (1917) of the Proto-Sinaitic inscriptions, found first by Petrie in 1906, was followed by the discovery of more inscriptions and by numerous attempts at decipherment (Cowley, Eisler, Grimme, Sprengling, Butin, Albright, etc.), none of which is entirely convincing. The most important work in this field is that of Butin. Meanwhile several finds in Palestine have almost closed the gap between these texts and the oldest ones of Phoenicia,⁵ so that the effective interpretation of the former seems to be only a matter of a few years, at most. The Phoenician alphabet is thus carried back at least a thousand years before the date of the Mesha Stone.

* Cf. *Bulletin Am. Sch. Or. Res.*, No. 58, pp. 28-9; No. 60, n. 6 f.

However, the most recent discoveries have complicated the problem of scripts in Syria-Palestine by disclosing the existence of at least four other systems of writing: the cuneiform alphabet, the syllabic script of Byblus,⁶ a new alphabetiform script from the same place,⁷ and a linear script from Moab.⁸

The decipherment of the cuneiform alphabetic texts merits a special paragraph, because of its exceptional importance. Discovered almost entirely at Ugarit (Râs esh-Shamrah and Mînet el-Beidâ) on the coast of northern Syria, since 1929, by Schaeffer and Chenet, they were deciphered by H. Bauer and Dhorme, and have been published by Virolleaud and Dhorme. The most important work in the interpretation of these documents has been accomplished by the above-mentioned scholars and Friedrich, Ginsberg, etc. Since they prove to be in a northern dialect of Canaanite, and to be closely related to the Phoenician mythological literature described by Philo Byblius, there can be no reasonable doubt that we have here part of the long-lost Phoenician literature of the second millennium B. C.

During the past fifty years very great progress has also been made in collecting and interpreting the South-Arabian inscriptions, as well as the graffiti in derived alphabets found in North Arabia, and generally called Lihyanic, Thamudic, and Safaitic.

⁶ See provisionally *ibid.*, No. 60, 4-6. This script belongs to the late third millennium.

⁷ See Dunand, *Mélanges Maspero*, Vol. I, pp. 567-71.

⁸ See Horsfield and Vincent, *Revue Biblique*, 1932, p. 425 and pl. XI. The writer believes that the inscription is much older than the relief, perhaps belonging to the latter part of the third millennium. In favor of this rather revolutionary dating are the following facts. First, the inscription is carved more lightly, and has been weathered far more than the relief. Second, the relief is in a rectangular space which was lowered considerably in order to receive it, the raised figures being still materially lower than the original flat surface of the stone. Third, the horizontal line below the fourth line of text, originally separating it from a no longer existing fifth line, stands in no recognizable relationship to the upper edge of the depressed space employed for the relief. Fourth, the form of the stela resembles that of the Naram-Sin stelae from the middle of the third millennium much more closely than it does any stela of the second millennium yet known. Fifth, the script itself is not at all like any known later script, but may easily be a variant of the syllabic script of Byblus. Sixth, Balû'ah, like many other large sites in this region, was occupied in the last third of the third millennium; cf. Glueck, *Annual Am. Sch. Or. Res.*, 14. 55.

At the beginning of the period the number of available texts was greatly increased by the explorations of Glaser, and in the past few years there has been a new influx of material, together with the first excavations. To list all the scholars who have contributed materially to the interpretation of these inscriptions would be tedious; we may single out Rhodokanakis as by far the most important recent investigator in this field.

Modern archaeological technique is almost entirely the product of the past half-century, and the rapidly developing field of comparative archaeology was in its infancy less than a generation ago. The pioneer work between 1842 and 1880 consisted almost exclusively of unsupervised digging by natives, whose work was occasionally visited by the archaeologist in charge. Perhaps the worst sinners in this respect were Mariette Pasha in Egypt and Hormuzd Rassam in Mesopotamia; the work of Botta and Layard, but especially of Place, was on a somewhat higher level. Best of the undertakings in this field at that time were the little-known excavations (1849—) of the English geologist, Loftus, who excelled in accuracy, in understanding of the possibilities of stratigraphy, and in attention to unexciting detail.

In 1870 a new era dawned in field archaeology—strangely enough as the result of the work of a dilettante banker, Heinrich Schliemann, at Hissarlik, generally believed to be the site of Homeric Troy. Here for the first time it was recognized that a town-site might contain the accumulation of many successive periods of occupation, separated by more or less complete destructions. This discovery, which seems so obvious today, was long opposed by archaeologists of standing. However, Schliemann's method remained primitive and rather ruthless until Dörpfeld joined his staff in 1882 and created the technique of digging mounds. Dörpfeld's outstanding achievement lay in the emphasis he placed on accurate planning and levelling of constructional remains, with careful analysis of details.

The next major contribution was made by Flinders Petrie in Egypt (1880—). Possessed of uncommon originality and independence of approach, he soon discovered that such unimportant remains as broken pottery might be used to advantage for chronological purposes. The turning-point came at Naucratis in 1885, where Greek painted pottery provided the point of departure. At Tell el-Ḥesī in Palestine, five years later, he excavated strati-

graphically in the second mound to be attacked in this fashion, Troy being the first; in his publication the following year he included numerous plates made up exclusively of drawings of potsherds. Contemporary archaeologists jeered, but Petrie was absolutely right, and no archaeologist who is worthy of the name today fails to devote careful attention to broken fragments of unpainted pottery, which have become the type-fossils of the excavator. In 1901 Petrie capped his previous ceramic research by publishing in *Diospolis Parva* his brilliant discovery of sequence-dating.

The method of excavating, analyzing, and recording stratified constructional remains and fortifications, first introduced by Dörpfeld, was applied by his contemporary, Koldewey, who began digging at Assos in the same year that the former began at Troy, then continued at Zinjirli in Syria, and finally undertook his life-work at Babylon (1899—). Koldewey and his able pupils, Andrae, Jordan, Nöldeke, and others, have established the highest standards yet attained for architects' excavations in stratified sites; Koldewey himself was inclined to neglect artifacts, but his pupils have utilized them fully, as may be seen from the reports on the excavations of Assur and Warka (Erech). The architectural publications of the Koldewey school are by far the best which have yet appeared. The methods of Dörpfeld and Koldewey have been brilliantly applied in Egypt by Borchardt and Hölscher.

In 1900 Reisner began his excavations in Egypt, and soon developed a new technique, which gradually superseded all others. Reisner was strongly influenced both by Borchardt and by Petrie, from whose respective schools he drew the best that they could supply. With characteristic thoroughness, he introduced American filing and recording methods, with a vastly increased use of photography. No excavator anywhere in the world has equalled the care in digging and the completeness in recording exhibited by Reisner in his best work, as in the tomb of Queen Hetep-heres. In his archaeological work it may be said that no phase is neglected, whether the technique of field-work, the recording of details, or the treatment of surveying, architecture, photography, and drawing. Of course, all this vastly increased the cost of excavation, especially in dealing with major sites. Followed closely by his pupils, Fisher, Winlock, and others, Reisner has created the most important contemporary school of excavators. His methods have been copied by British archaeologists, notably by Woolley, Frank-

fort (whose training was almost wholly English), Garstang, Guy, Rowe, Starkey, and have powerfully influenced German and French excavators.

The high-water mark in field archaeology has been attained during the past ten years by the expeditions of the Oriental Institute, which has drawn the best available talent from every source. In the excavation of mounds Fisher, Frankfort, and their pupils have shown how much historical material may be recovered by digging relatively wide areas, recording everything, and interpreting the results by the most up-to-date methods of comparative archaeology. In recording inscriptions and reliefs Nelson and his assistants have raised a new standard of mechanical accuracy, artistic excellence, and sound interpretation. Hölscher's architectural work represents the culmination of the progress so far achieved by the German school. We may rest assured that, in coming years, archaeological method will become more and more refined, so that the amount excavated with a given sum of money will progressively dwindle, and the results obtained in a given area or volume will steadily increase. The importance of chemical, geological, and biological methods, such as pollen analysis and dendrochronology, is certain to become greater as time goes on.

Comparative archaeology is a relatively new discipline, which arose first in the study of prehistoric European materials, during the second half of the nineteenth century, as well as more or less contemporaneously in the study of painted Greek vases. It was not until the last decade of the century that the comparative study of pottery reached a plane, thanks to the work of men like Furtwängler and Pottier, where it could claim independent historical value. With the general acceptance of Petrie's new point of view, this discipline has continued to develop until it is now a most effective instrument in the hands of a Frankfort. The comparative treatment of architecture in the Ancient Orient has also reached a very high standard in the work of Andrae, Watzinger, and Engelbach. Since 1919 the study of ancient art has been revolutionized by the brilliant book of H. Schäfer, *Von der ägyptischen Kunst*; the best work in the field of comparative oriental art is being done by scholars like Moortgat. Most investigation in this field is still of unequal value, and the methodology is decidedly heterogeneous. So long as men of the caliber of Herzfeld and Moortgat (with whom the writer agrees) can differ by

a millennium and a half with regard to the date of the Tell Halâf orthostates, it is obvious that we are in some respects still in the kindergarten. However, material improvement here can only be expected from additional stratigraphic evidence; in other words, the further development of comparative archaeology is contingent on the further extension of the methods employed by the Reisner school of field archaeology.

That we have now reached a point in our knowledge of the Ancient Orient where successful handbooks and syntheses may be made, has been emphasized by Berve, though we do not agree that this point marks the end of productive investigation—quite the contrary! Egyptian culture is adequately and authoritatively portrayed by Erman, Ranke, and Kees; Mesopotamian civilization receives the same treatment in Meissner's remarkably complete work; Asia Minor has been given similar consideration by Götze; Watzinger and Nielsen have prepared handbooks of Palestinian and Arabian culture. The *Reallexikon der Vorgeschichte* and the *Reallexikon der Assyriologie* are examples of efforts to fill the increasing need for cyclopaedic treatment of the Ancient Oriental data, a need well provided for in the classical field by Pauly-Wissowa, Daremberg-Saglio, etc.

Comparisons are often invidious, but they are always instructive if accurately and clearly made. The student of the Ancient Orient may properly ask whether he is abreast of investigators in other similar fields of research, comparing each separate phase with analogous phases elsewhere. We may safely expect that the general result of such comparisons will be satisfactory, but that there will be departments of investigation in which the Orientalist has either not caught up with scholars in other fields, or has fallen behind them. When we take the relative paucity of workers in our field into account, this expectation seems only reasonable.

In the department of linguistic study a comparison will yield very unequal results. The Orientalist is undoubtedly more at home in the technique of decipherment, and is, therefore, more likely to be successful in problems of this nature. The methods used by grammarians and lexicographers are the same, and considering the relative difficulty of our material, our results are as good. In fact, the classical scholar is perhaps more likely to accept meanings and principles on authority. On the other hand, the temptation to be cavalier in the treatment of grammatical obscurities is

undoubtedly greater in the interpretation of imperfectly understood texts, and is characteristic of many contemporary students in our field. Comparative linguistic science has been more honored in the breach than in the observance, as pointed out last year by Professor Kent, but it must be emphasized that the situation in the Semitic field is not nearly so serious as he indicated, since his illustrations were mostly drawn from the work of scholars recognized as linguistically incompetent in nearly all Orientalistic circles. While it is quite true that analytical and interpretative philological research of the kind now familiar in the classical, modern European, and biblical fields has hardly been begun by Egyptologists and Assyriologists, it is also true that the gain from this negative orientation of research has been much greater than the loss: first, because its necessarily subjective character would injure the reputation of our studies; secondly, because our field would be cluttered with unfounded hypotheses before it was completely ready for cultivation. However, Grapow and Pieper have begun to study Egyptian stylistic and literary phenomena, while Schott has commenced the historical arrangement of Accadian literary texts by statistical observation of their stylistic usages.

It is not necessary to repeat what we have said about the historical relation between archaeological research in northern Mediterranean regions and in the Near East. From its very nature, archaeological technique is not bound by sharp limits, and technique may be transferred from one region to another with relative ease. On the whole, European archaeology owes more to Near Eastern studies than the reverse. The precise and painstaking attention to detail that characterizes the best Scandinavian archaeology, for example, is no greater than that shown by Reisner and Woolley in digging royal tombs. Of course, the best North-European and American archaeological work can hold up a standard of meticulous care in dealing with unexciting houses and areas which Orientalists have seldom reached. Climatic and other causes also make it difficult for the members of a staff to do much of the actual digging themselves. It is instructive to note that Kjaer's efforts to transplant Danish methods to Palestine in 1926, 1929, and 1931 did not yield the expected results; his work was very good, but did not yield any new technical method. In comparative archaeology we are witnessing a remarkable fusion of fields, especially in the hands of Childe, Frankfort, V. Müller,

Matz, and others, following in the footsteps of Poulsen and von Bissing.

We have passed rapidly over the principal fields of Ancient Oriental research, and have appraised their present state in the light of their history and of conditions in parallel fields. Shall we set ourselves the task of estimating the extent to which we can penetrate into the heart of the Ancient Orient and can understand it as we would understand a more modern civilization? Berve's use of such terms as "exotic" and "strange" at once removes us from the domain of solid anthropological investigation to that of romanticism. His comparison of the relation between ancient Egyptian culture and modern European with the contrast between the Egyptian landscape and the European (German?) is singularly illogical. To Americans, whose country includes geographical regions as diverse from one another as the forests of Maine, the prairies of Nebraska, the jungles of central Florida, and the torrid deserts of Arizona, such a comparison belongs in the realm of the unreal. The writer, who has lived for twelve years of his life in Chile, for sixteen years in different parts of the United States, and for most of the past sixteen years in Palestine, finds the Nile Valley, with which he is familiar, far more homelike than central and eastern Germany, where he has spent three days.

Since there is no direct objective criterion by which we may measure the extent of our penetration into the ultimate nature (whatever that obscure term may mean) of any psychological organism, whether individual or social, we must find indirect means of estimating our knowledge. A brief consideration of the possibilities and limitations with which we are faced in dealing with any cultural phenomena of a psychological nature, may be of decisive importance to us at this stage of our inquiry. There is an apparently impassable barrier set up before the investigator who wishes to understand the complex underlying psychology of any human organism. The intelligent biographer has long since recognized that he cannot pierce the veil of personality, with its infinite complexity and the intricate play of combinatory factors under the visible surface. It is a commonplace that a man's wife or intimate friends often understand him much better than he does himself; yet close friends will differ radically in their estimate of a man's personality, and the gulf between Plato's and Xenophon's description of Socrates may be paralleled innumerable

times in later literature. The biographical school to which Strachey, Maurois, Nicolson, and Ludwig belong, has tried to solve the enigma of personality by psychological methods, but this simply introduces a new group of unknown factors into an already complex situation, since the measure of correctness found in the widely diverging systems of Freud, Adler, Jung, Wertheimer, etc., cannot be objectively calculated. Maurois frankly admits that the rôle of the biographer is like that of the portrait painter, to reproduce the subject as he sees it, with accurate delineation of facts, with such psychological insight as he can obtain by analysis aided by flashes of intuition, and with constant attention to artistic completeness of the resulting picture.

Nor are we situated much more favorably when we deal with cultural or social groups, since the difficulty of estimating concealed psychological factors in the individual is replaced by the equal one of combining the innumerable elements and tendencies of any culture into a picture which is fair to most of the data. The same is true when we try to evaluate historical movements and to control the hidden causes of cultural mutations. Robinson's "new history" of a few years back was really the same type of critical historiography that his predecessors had developed in the nineteenth century, colored by a new dogmatism, born of a melioristic enthusiasm. Modern historical methods have revolutionized the writing of history, because they have given us new ways in which to gather, sift, and interpret facts, and because they have placed constant emphasis on the importance of accuracy, impartiality, and caution, but they have not advanced our objective grasp of causes at all. The importance of the philosophy of history is very great—never perhaps greater—but its value consists in widening our horizon and in giving us a clearer understanding of genetic relationships, not in enlarging our store of factual data. The same is true, *mutatis mutandis*, of the philosophy of science, in which interest has grown so steadily of late.

It is, therefore, true that we cannot fully understand any culture or any historical field. The more we love it, in fact, the more prejudiced we become and the less able to see it in proper perspective. Even facts are distorted when we see them through a diffracting medium. Treitschke's dictum, cited above, is thus in part directly opposed to the facts. It is not an accident that the two most remarkable pictures of American culture, from different

aspects, which we possess, come from the British statesman Bryce, and the French journalist Siegfried. Both saw America with interested, but critical eyes. All that prevented Eduard Meyer's war-time description of America from being equally good is probably the hostile, and consequently unfavorably prejudiced, attitude which war psychology imposed upon his otherwise remarkably fair judgment. In other words, the soundest judgments come, not from the blind lover of country and culture, but from the sympathetic, yet dispassionate foreign observer. An Erman or a Breasted can understand ancient Egypt better than a Pharaoh or a learned scribe, even though the modern interpreter may lack many details needed to present a complete picture. The main difference between our comprehension of ancient and of modern culture is that our knowledge of the former is more fragmentary than our knowledge of the latter. In all fundamental respects there is little difference.

The doubter may ask with Berve: But what of the strange Ancient Oriental world or worlds of ideas and religion? Our reply will be identical: There is no fundamental psychological difference. The religions of Egyptians, Mesopotamians, prephilosophical or illiterate Greeks, and of pagan Germans were closely parallel in their conceptual imagery and in the tendencies which they exhibited. The far-reaching studies of Bertholet on *Dynamismus*, on *Götterspaltung und Göttervereinigung* apply with equal cogency to all. As we shall see below, there is no road from primitive and savage thought to Europe which does not pass directly through the Ancient Orient. It is likely that we have a clearer idea of the *kuš* ("ka") than the ancient Egyptian possessed, and that the term *ikkibu* means as much to us, in every conceptually significant sense, as it did to the Babylonian; if we exaggerate, it is simply because our material is not yet as complete as it will become. Of course, these terms connoted many more concrete associations to the men of the Ancient Orient, but the genetic and comparative data which clarify our understanding of them were denied to the latter.

There is another, highly important, side to the question of the extent of our knowledge, a side which Berve has correctly emphasized, the *Wertforderung*. Knowledge is not only useless, we can not even obtain full possession of it unless it can somehow be made serviceable, unless it proves fruitful. This certainly does

not mean that knowledge must be exposed for sale in the marketplace at the earliest opportunity; it does not mean that Egyptian medicine may supplant modern practices, nor that a knowledge of Assyrian may mysteriously bring its possessor nearer to the fountain-head of theosophic wisdom. In other words, it does not mean that knowledge should be utilitarian in the short-sighted meaning which this term generally has. But racist romanticism and instrumental pragmatism agree that knowledge must somehow be made useful if it is worth cultivation, and even if it merits the designation "knowledge." Our final task will thus be to point out some ways in which our knowledge of the Ancient Orient can be useful.

Our knowledge of the Ancient Orient is so many-sided that one is at a loss which elements to stress. Its most obvious importance lies in the field of history. Every archaeological and philological discovery made in the Ancient Orient has contributed something to show the continuity and essential solidarity of Western culture, beginning in the eastern Mediterranean basin, including Mesopotamia, and shifting to Europe. The recovery of the Ancient Orient has doubled the span of human history as recorded in contemporary written documents; it has nearly trebled the duration of archaeologically recorded sedentary society. In thus extending the chronological scope of Western, European history, it has given us a vastly enlarged perspective in studying all phases of history, from material culture to the history of religion. The light cast by this new knowledge on the development of the religious institutions which preceded and partly inspired our own, is alone worth all the effort put into the Ancient Oriental field. Some idea of the increasing influence exerted by the latter on philosophers of history may be obtained from a survey of the widespread repercussions of Petrie's theory of cycles of civilization, as recently sketched by Crawford. Spengler's grandiose but oracular synthesis will be followed by many others.

It would be easy to give innumerable illustrations of specific gains in various branches of the disciplines which deal with man. The futility of attempting to separate man's past from his present seldom needs to be emphasized in the Old World, all too conscious of the impracticability of escaping from the past, but in the New World it has not been clearly recognized except by a limited number of scholars and thinkers. In fact, there is a certain school of

thought, centered in Chicago, which speaks of the "past past"—as though there were any fundamental difference between a past that is partly accessible through direct oral testimony, and a past that is only accessible through the written record of oral witnesses! We need not follow Jung and believe that man's subconscious mind transmits countless impulses inherited from the past and translatable into symbolic form, but the fact remains that our modern culture may be traced back to an even greater number of sources, partly in barbarian Eurasia, but at least as often in the Ancient Orient. Since our thinking remains conditioned by cultural forms, we are just as much children of the past as though we actually inherited ancestral motives and symbols of thought.

Contemporary scientific thought is coming more and more to see the importance of studying any organism which is the result of an evolutionary process in the light of that process—in other words, genetically or historically. This is true of biological organisms, it is true of any system of thought, and it is just as true of any science. Modern sociology is unintelligible to the philosopher without a rather intimate knowledge of its history—a much longer one than many contemporary sociologists believe. In the history of a given type of social organization, or a given system of law or religion, it will be impossible in future to overlook the wealth of data available as the result of our work. The history of law, economics, and political science has a vast mine of material in the legal codes, business documents, contracts, and treaties which have been deciphered and interpreted by Assyriologists and jurists. We venture to predict that the observations of Koschaker with regard to the relation between ancient customary law and legal formulation, or of Alt with reference to the distinction between casuistic and apodictic law, will before long be recognized as fundamental by all historians and philosophers of jurisprudence, just as the observations of Schäfer have revolutionized our understanding of the nature and development of art.

The value of the Ancient Orient for the student of cultural anthropology has not yet been adequately recognized, either by anthropologists or by specialists in the Ancient Orient. In a sense our branch of investigation is really a part of cultural anthropology, since the Ancient Orientals were in many respects in the same intellectual stage of evolution as the more advanced peoples with which the anthropologist has been concerned, e. g., the Mayas.

The anthropologist is faced with many problems of a general type which he cannot solve with the data now at his disposal, as, for example, the question of the relative or absolute age of the belief in a supreme god of abstract nature, the age and source of certain myths, or of specific cultural elements. The old question of diffusion versus the principle of *Völkergedanken*, the problem of the primary or secondary character of "totemistic" phenomena, and many similar ones, demand solution. Since our written sources for nearly all savage cultures do not antedate the seventeenth century, and seldom, in fact, precede the nineteenth, it is obviously of the very greatest importance to have authentic material of the same kind going back five thousand years. Further discoveries and fresh decipherment will never yield any remotely comparable material in India, China, and Central America, where the texts are either recent, as in Middle America (since the Christian era), or brief and formulaic, as in all three regions, whose earliest epigraphic records are tantalizingly terse.

In one little appreciated respect our new knowledge of the Ancient Orient will perhaps be of fundamental significance in the future, and here it may even help to save our seriously threatened scientific civilization. We have no historical justification for considering our boasted scientific progress as permanent; it stagnated and finally became completely inert less than two thousand years ago—why not again? Unhappily it seems impossible for man to advance steadily in any direction for more than a relatively short time. During the past three centuries the unprecedented development of science has actually been a surface phenomenon; the hosts of magic and neo-gnosticism have been far more numerous, and have repeatedly gained the upper hand. So far from the situation being more favorable today, precisely the opposite is true. Even in Germany, the intellectual leader of the world for a century, the movement toward irrationalism has been gaining momentum for two decades. Ten years ago the *Astrologische Gesellschaft* was larger than any half-dozen scientific societies together and its list of publications was more impressive than theirs. In Erman's instructive autobiography he speaks with feeling of the growth of irrational ideologies and the unmistakable eclipse of inductive science. The speed with which such forms of Ancient Oriental magic, thinly disguised, as spiritism, clairvoyance, and rhabdomancy (dowsing) are sweeping over the world under our

very eyes is absolutely terrifying. Dowsing is now used all over Europe (there is a flourishing British Society of Dowsters) for detecting sources of water and minerals and metals of all kinds, as well as for plotting archaeological remains! At the Sorbonne and in British Columbia there has been within the past two or three years official recognition of the principle of dowsing over large-scale maps, instead of passing the willow wand over the actual terrain. It is increasingly hard to find people who do not believe in some form of spiritism, clairvoyance, astrology, or rhabdomancy. When an Assyriologist like Alfred Jeremias becomes an admirer of Hermann Wirth, and when other forms of theosophy and of anthroposophy are accepted by numerous scholars and men of science, it is clear that neo-gnosticism is in our very midst. And most of these pseudo-sciences and pseudo-disciplines have their root in the Ancient Orient; some of them, such as astrology, can be traced directly back to Babylonian sources, and the successive stages of their evolution and transmission can already be mapped with considerable detail. It would be strange if the Assyriologist were yet to come to the defense of the serious astronomer!

In comparison with the value of Ancient Oriental studies for the anthropological, sociological, and historical sciences, their importance for the natural sciences and technology is insignificant. And yet it is greater than we may think. We shall not speak of accidental finds, such as Glueck's discovery of iron in the 'Arabah of Palestine, or of the numerous by-products of an archaeologist's activity, since they do not spring from the science of the Ancient Orient. It is, however, quite germane to speak of the increasing cooperation between archaeologists and philologists, on the one hand, and geologists, geographers, botanists, zoologists, climatologists, etc., on the other. The dating of recent geological and geographical movements or events is often in the hand of the archaeologist. The Ancient Orientalist has thrown light on the date of many geological processes, such as the movement of the north shore of the Persian Gulf or the date at which the Euphrates and Tigris changed their courses. The difficult problem of climatic cycles is almost entirely dependent on archaeological and documentary data, as was well illustrated by all Ellsworth Huntington's earliest work. Since the latter's conclusions have been adopted in recent handbooks of meteorology, one of which devotes a special chapter to his work, the verdict of the competent archaeologist and historian

is naturally important. The writer, in common with Olmstead and Eduard Meyer, believes that Huntington is entirely wrong, and that all his archaeological and documentary data have been misinterpreted. Many problems of irrigation, forest ecology, and soil conservation are bound up with archaeological evidence to a much greater extent than we may realize. The flourishing young field of dendrochronology is inseparable from archaeology, and we may have to wait for decisive proof of the correctness of its assumptions until it is successfully applied to the Ancient Oriental material. Such physical sciences as mineralogy, chemistry, and physics may be most useful to the archaeologist, but the reverse will probably be rarely the case, if ever. Even in mineralogy, however, we owe the discovery of the importance of the copper deposits of 'Omân largely to the work of a committee of the British Association for the Advancement of Science which was entrusted with the task of finding the source of Sumerian copper!⁹ Some very interesting chemical discoveries have arisen from the study of problems set by archaeologists. Wood's brilliant solution of the elusive problem of Tutankhamon's purple gold¹⁰ not only yielded new scientific results, but it also brought about the rediscovery of a most interesting lost technical process—not the only one, we may safely suppose. The biologist may also gain much by cooperation, as shown by the remarkable additions to our knowledge of the history of Holocene fauna and of animal domestication by Hilzheimer, or by the instructive researches of Keimer on Egyptian flora. In fact the Ancient Orient provides a surprisingly large amount of the data which are employed by biologists who are interested in the evolution and migration of domesticated animals and plants.

We have spoken little of the contribution of the Ancient Orient to the humanities, as distinct from historical research. The discovery of new literary masterpieces, of new forms of written activity, of artistic *chefs d'oeuvre*, and of novel types of aesthetic expression have probably been justification enough in themselves. But the greatest justification of all from this point of view is perhaps the career of the late James Henry Breasted, whose memory this Society must ever cherish as its greatest asset. What he accomplished for the humanities and for humanistic research

⁹ Peake, *Antiquity*, December 1928, pp. 452-7.

¹⁰ *Jour. Eg. Archaeol.*, 20. 62 ff.

in this country cannot easily be measured, since it is so far-reaching and so many-sided. A few words with regard to it will, therefore, be decidedly germane to our theme.

During the past half-century there has been no lack of provision in the United States for the natural sciences. Academic departments, industrial laboratories, and government bureaus have competed with one another in supporting teachers and investigators, while wealth has been poured into them with the hope of far-reaching technical returns. In recent decades there has been increasing interest in the social sciences, which have been liberally supported both by the state and by private foundations. The humanities, however, have not fared so well, for reasons which lie on the surface, but are not always realized.

In part this latent hostility to the humanities is the outcome of a feeling that research in fields relating to the past history and achievements of man is useless, especially in a new land with its history before it. It arises partly also from the short-sighted conviction that only research which yields immediate results in the form of mechanical inventions and technical processes is worth while. Since most men of science are idealistic in their aims and willing to be convinced, while some are amateurs of literature and the arts, there must be another reason for this opposition to humanistic research on their part. A century ago the study of Latin and Greek was intrenched in all American institutions of higher learning, and little or no place was allowed for instruction, much less investigation, in the fields of natural science. In earlier centuries Latin and Greek had been essential elements in any adequate professional training, while experience had shown their merit as vehicles of general literary, historical, and philosophical culture. But by the middle of the nineteenth century the direct practical value of Latin and Greek in America became more and more questionable, especially since few students acquired anything but a useless smattering of them. The movement to abandon them and to substitute modern languages and science was led by the natural scientists, who fought a bitter and apparently futile battle against conservatism. This battle has long since been won, but the natural scientists have inherited from their predecessors a hostility to the very word "humanities" which by 1920 had brought humanistic research to a singularly low level in American intellectual life.

That the situation is now incomparably more encouraging we owe mainly to the vision of one man, James Henry Breasted.

It is not our place here to sketch the career of our late colleague; his achievements are so well known to the members of this Society that the effort would seem rather feeble.* We wish, however, to stress one fact, recognized more than fifteen years ago by his prophetic vision: the recovery of the Ancient Orient is giving so great a spur to historical studies in general that it can only be compared with the effect upon scientific research in general of the revival of learning. In the fourteenth century few would have ventured to predict that the rediscovery of Greek literature would result in unexampled progress in the natural sciences—yet the connection is admitted by all historians. Few historians of the nineteenth century would probably have believed that the rediscovery of the Ancient Orient would revolutionize historical investigation—yet the philosopher of the twenty-first century may well regard this as self-evident, repeating the observation of Voltaire, “Il faut écrire l’histoire en philosophe.”

* See now the writer's sketch, “James Henry Breasted, Humanist,” *The American Scholar*, June, 1936, pp. 287-299.

TYPES OF RUBRICS IN THE EGYPTIAN BOOK OF THE DEAD

T. GEORGE ALLEN

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

SOME YEARS ago Professor Breasted intrusted to the writer the publication of two late manuscripts of the Egyptian Book of the Dead which had been presented to the Oriental Institute Museum at the University of Chicago. Though pressure of other duties has prevented the devotion of more than a small part of each year to pursuit of the requisite background, the contents of both papyri have been identified and comparison of variants has made considerable progress.¹ The present paper, in memory of Professor Breasted, seeks to present a new viewpoint for examining one phase of Egyptian mortuary literature, in which, as in so many subjects, he was keenly interested.²

The later papyri of the Book of the Dead exemplify especially well the combination of three features of which a spell may consist. That is, the text is usually accompanied by an illustration or "vignette," and the text itself comprises not only the magic words of the charm proper but one or more "rubrics" (if we may include under that head the titles as well as the postscripts of various sorts).

Vignettes are lacking in the earliest mortuary literature preserved, the Old Kingdom Pyramid Texts. In the Middle Kingdom they are very rare, though they do occur in both coffins and papyri. In the Empire Book of the Dead they become more and more prevalent. From the beginning they not only illustrate the text in some

¹ On Papyrus Milbank cf. the writer's article in *AJSL* 49 (1933). 141-49.

² For the history of Egyptian mortuary literature as a whole the reader is referred to Sethe's admirable and thoroughly documented account, "Die Totenliteratur der alten Ägypter; die Geschichte einer Sitte," *Sitzungsberichte der Preuss. Akad. der Wiss.*, Phil.-hist. Kl., 1931, pp. 520-41. The reference in n. 3 on his p. 536 is to be changed; the 21st dyn. hieroglyphic papyrus of Nojmet is not the MS published by Budge, but is that called Pq by Naville. On p. 535 the statement that vignettes began in the 18th dyn. can now be modified, for some have since been found in a Middle Kingdom papyrus; see Capart, "Un papyrus du Livre des Morts aux Musées royaux d'art et d'histoire," *Bulletin de l'Académie royale . . . de Belgique*, Classe des lettres . . . XX (1934). 243-51.

fashion, but may in turn be explained by text of their own in the form of legends. As with the main text (cf. below), misplacement of the vignettes and corruption of elements in them are by no means unknown; and much comparative study could be devoted to determining original forms and connections. The Institute's Papyrus Ryerson is particularly culpable on the score of misplacement. Even the careful 21st dynasty Papyrus Greenfield in the British Museum (ed. Budge) suffers from both troubles. In its first occurrence of Spell 148, for example, the cows, bull, and rudders of 148 are pictured with the text of 141-42, five pages ahead of their proper place; and the seven cows of the text have become eight in the drawing.

The rubrics were largely in red, as the term implies, though even the titles might be in black instead. Both colors are found in the coffins³ and also papyri of the Middle Kingdom. The similar situation under the Empire is partially obscured by the fact that Naville's publication of Empire manuscripts⁴ does not distinguish between red and black. The Turin papyrus of Efonekh⁵ illustrates the combination of colors in the late period. Papyrus Ryerson, on the other hand, though it contains elaborately colored vignettes, is written throughout in black only.

The purpose of a spell is ostensibly given in its title; but even in the Middle Kingdom the relationship was often mystical or rested on a misunderstanding. The rest of the rubrics include directions for use, claims and testimonials, restrictions on use, and injunctions to secrecy. In a few cases an account of the discovery is given. These additions as a whole are quite suggestive of modern patent medicine advertising. As with prescriptions found in Egyptian "medical" literature, much use is made of sympathetic magic. For example, directions found as early as the Middle Kingdom for use of a spell against enemies read:⁶

³ Contrast e.g. the red titles in A. de Buck, *The Egyptian Coffin Texts* (hereafter called *ECT*) I (Chicago, 1935). 1, with the black ones *ibid.* p. 157.

⁴ *Das ägyptische Tottenbuch der XVIII. bis. XX. Dynastie . . .* hrsg. von Edouard Naville (3 vols.; Berlin, 1886).

⁵ *Das Tottenbuch der Ägypter nach dem hieroglyphischen Papyrus in Turin . . .* hrsg. von R. Lepsius (Leipzig, 1842).

⁶ Symbols used in the translations that follow are: ' ', uncertain; (), inserted by translator; < >, emended from later parallels.

To be said over an image of the enemy, made of wax, with the name of that enemy written on its breast with the 'abomination' of the *wp*-fish, put into the ground in the place of Osiris.⁷

Because of the multiplicity and diversity of its rubrics Spell 148 of the Book of the Dead has been chosen as the best illustration of the "patent medicine" parallel. A translation of the 18th dynasty wording, apparently the oldest, follows, based on extensive comparisons of manuscripts. As a matter of present convenience the contents have been divided into numbered sections.⁸ Closer subdivision⁹ would be required if our purpose extended to the discussion of all contemporary and later variants.

It must be confessed at the outset that no individual manuscript contains all the sections here dealt with and that they never constituted a single whole. But each part is found tied in with others, as will appear below. The ramifications of parallel passages observed extend to Naville's spells 15 B III (for §§ 1-6), 30 B (for §§ 20 and 22-23), 64 (for §§ 19-23), and 137 A (for § 21). Texts utilized were as follows:

15 B III: Af, Ba, Cg, Ia, La, Pa, Pc

30 B: Cg, Ig, Ih, Pf; R, T

64: Aa, Ca, Ce (Pls. IX and XVI), Cg, Ea (Pls. 26 and 44 f.), Ga, Pb; M

137 A: Ea (Pl. 57)

148: Aa, Ap, Ax, Ba, Ce (Pls. X f. and XII), Cf, Cg (Pls. XL f. and XLVIII f.), Ea (Pls. 21 f. and 31), Eb, Ec (Pls. XLV f. and CXV), Ee, Ga, Pb, Pc; Cairo 29301, 29305, 41001, 41001 bis, 41025; M, R, T.¹⁰

⁷ *EOT* I. 156-57.

⁸ Following Grapow's method in *Urkunden des ägyptischen Altertums*, 5. Abt. (Leipzig, 1915—).

⁹ Cf. that adopted by Dr. Gardiner and Dr. de Buck in *EOT*.

¹⁰ The designations are those assigned by Naville, *op. cit.*, by Sethe in *Zeitschrift für ägyptische Sprache* LVII (1922), and by the *Cairo Catalogue général*, with the following additions:

Ee Hieratic papyrus of the royal mother Nojmet pub. by Budge in British Museum, *Book of the Dead: Facsimiles of the Papyri of Hunefer, Anhai, Kerushar and Netchemet with Supplementary Text . . . of Nu* (London, 1899).

M Papyrus Milbank } owned by the Oriental Institute of the University
R Papyrus Ryerson } of Chicago.

T Turin papyrus of Efonekh pub. by Lepsius.

SPELL 148 AND ADDITIONS ¹¹

(§ 1. Title)

Roll (telling how) to make excellent the spirit (*ḥ*) in the favor of Re, put his might before Atum, magnify him before Osiris, put his power before the Presider over the Westerners, and put his augustness before the Ennead.

(§ 2. Directions: When to be used)

This roll is to be used on the 'first' day of the month, at the feast of the 6th, at the *wḥg*-feast, at the feast of Thoth, on the birthday of Osiris, at the feast of Sokar, and on the night of the *ḥḥr*-feast.

(§ 3. Claims)

(This roll reveals) secrets of Duat, mysteries of the nether world—(how to) cleave the mountains and open the valleys—and secrets wholly unknown—(how to) treat the heart of the spirit, broaden his steps, give him his (powers of) locomotion, do away with his deafness, and restore his sight, along with (the doing of these same things for) the god.

(§ 4. Injunction to Secrecy)

Thou shalt use (this roll) without letting anyone see it except thy true confidant and the lector priest, without letting any other person see it, not even a slave who has come from abroad.¹²

(§ 5. Directions: Where to be used)

Thou shalt use it within a tent of cloth with an all-over design of stars <of yellow>.

(§ 6. Claims)

As for every spirit for whom this roll is used, his soul (*bḥ*) goes forth with the living, it goes forth by day, it is mighty among the gods. He for whom it is used is one whom they cannot repulse. These gods shall

The probable dates of the texts listed are:

18th dyn.: Aa, Af, Ax, Ca, Ce, Ea, Ia, Ig, Pa, Pb, Pc, Pf.

19th dyn.: Ap, Ba, Eb, Ga, Ih, La.

21st dyn.: Cf, Cg, Ec, Ee.

700 B. C.: Cairo 41001, 41001 bis, 41025.

Persian-Ptolemaic: Cairo 29301, 29305; R.

Ptolemaic: M, T.

For some of these only Naville's variants were available. On the drawbacks of his edition cf. *EOI* I. xv.

¹¹ The various translations by Budge and that of Naville (in Renouf, *The Life-Work*, Vol. IV) have been compared, but are not commented on here, since they were based on more meager facilities than are now available.

¹² After making his translation the writer was gratified to find this passage similarly treated by Gardiner, *Egyptian Grammar* (Oxford, 1927) § 505: 5.

escort him, they shall acknowledge him; and he shall be like one of them, that he may tell thee what happens to him 'in the light'.

(§ 7. Injunction to Secrecy)

This roll is a real, real secret. <Nobody else is to know it forever, it is not to be told to anyone,> no <eye is to> see it, <no ear is to hear it. No one is to be permitted to see it except him and his teacher. Be not talkative.>

(§ 8. Injunction to Secrecy)

<It is a real secret.> Of all people none of the rabble is to be permitted to know it.

(§ 9. Title)

Spell for provisioning the spirit in the nether world, giving <provisions to> his soul on earth, and making him live forever, (since) nothing can prevail over him.

(§ 10. Directions: By whom to be used)

To be said by N.: ¹³

(§§ 11-14. The Spell Itself)

Hail to thee, thou who shinest in thy ¹⁴ disk, living one, who hast come forth from the horizon. N. ¹⁵ knows thee, he knows thy name, he knows the names of thy seven cows and their bull. (O ye) who give bread and beer to the living and who provision the Westerners, ¹⁶ may ye give bread and beer <to N.>, may ye provision <him>, may ye give him spirithood, may he follow you, and may he come to be under your buttocks. ¹⁷

Thou of the House of Kas, mistress of the universe; Storm Cloud holding aloft the god; Thou of the Realm of the Dead, ¹⁸ presiding over thy ¹⁹ place; Thou of Khemmis, who didst bind up the god; Thou Whose Love Is Great, red-haired one; Possessor of Life, 'bright-red' one; Thou Whose

¹³ "N." represents the name of the deceased, including all epithets, titles, and genealogical data.

¹⁴ Literally "his."

¹⁵ The more logical 1st per., though it does occur sporadically, is far outweighed in this spell by the 3d. Yet cf. Sethe, "Die Totenliteratur," pp. 525-27, 531, and 533 f. Is not desire on the part of even the non-royal to perpetuate their names one factor responsible for the change? Another may have been a desire to make unmistakable throughout the identity of the beneficiary, so that no good might go astray.

¹⁶ I. e. the dead.

¹⁷ Naville (in Renouf, *op. cit.*, p. 317) compares with this suckling by the divine cows the suckling of Hatshepsut by the Hathor-cow pictured at Deir el-Bahri.

¹⁸ The variant " 'Hidden One' " is also frequent.

¹⁹ Literally "her."

Name Prevails through Her Art; ²⁰ and thou Bull, male of the cows; may ye give bread and beer, food-offerings, provisions, and spirithood to N., the (most) excellent spirit in the nether world.

O good Power of the sky, opener of the disk, good rudder of the northern sky; O Circler, leader of the Two Lands, good rudder of the western sky; O Sunshine dwelling in the House of the Divine Images, good rudder of the eastern sky; O Foremost One dwelling in the House of the Red Ones, good rudder of the southern sky; may ye give bread and beer, oxen and geese, and spirithood to N., the (most) excellent spirit <in> the nether world. May ye give him life, prosperity, health, gladness, and continuance on earth. May ye give him the sky, the earth, the horizon, Heliopolis, and Duat, for he knows them all.

O fathers of the gods, O mothers of the gods, ye who are above the earth and ye who are in the nether world, may ye rescue N. from all evil harm, from all evil suffering, from that 'snarer with cruel knives', from everything bad and evil that men or gods or spirits or the dead may threaten to do against him today, tonight, this month, this half-month, this year, and annually.

(§ 15. Directions: How to be used)

To be said by a man before Re when he takes his place over these gods, (and) to be written in green on a tablet. There are to be set out for them in their presence food-offerings of bread and beer, flesh and fowl, and incense; and mortuary offerings are to be made to them.

(§ 16. Claims)

It is effective with Re.²¹ It is (a means of) provisioning the spirit in the nether world; it is (a means of) rescuing a man from everything evil.

(§ 17. Restriction on Use)

Do not use it in behalf of anyone except thine own self—this roll of Unnofer.

(§ 18. Claims and Testimonial)

As for him for whom this is used, Re shall be his rudder and his protection, and <none of> his enemies shall <attack> him in the nether world, in the sky, on earth, or in any place whither he may go. It is (a means of) provisioning the spirit <in the nether world>, being a really valuable spell, (tried and proved) a million times.

²⁰Legends found in post-18th dyn. vignettes give additional checks on reading and order of these seven cow names among others. The order used above definitely predominates. It occurs even in Cairo 41025, where Moret (*Sarcophages de l'époque bubastite à l'époque saïte*, pp. 250 f.) mistakenly took the cows by lines instead of by columns. The positions of the names can be checked by his Pl. XXVI (not XXVII as stated on his p. 249), which reproduces "côté 4" (not "côté 3").

²¹Or: "It is (a means of obtaining) spirithood from Re" ?

(§ 19. Claims)

Now as for him who knows this spell, that means that he is vindicated on earth and in the nether world and does all that the living do. Indeed, it is the great(est) protection of the god.

(§ 20. Account of the Discovery)

This spell was found in Hermopolis on a block of *dy*3-mineral of Upper Egypt, inscribed in real lapis lazuli (blue), under the feet of the majesty of this god in the time of the majesty of King Menkure, deceased, by Prince Hardedef, deceased, who found it when he was going about to take stock of the temples. Though might was with him ²² on that account, he obtained it for himself by entreaty and brought it as a marvel to the King when he saw that it was a great secret, unseen, unbeheld.²³

(§ 21. Restriction on Use)

This spell is to be read by one who is pure and clean,²⁴ without eating quadrupeds or fish and without being intimate with women.²⁵

(§ 22. Directions: With what to be used)

Now there is to be made ²⁶ a scarab of 'nephrite', 'set' ²⁷ and adorned with gold, (to be) put inside the man's heart; and there is to be performed for him (the ceremony of) opening the mouth, it²⁸ being anointed with myrrh.

(§ 23. Directions: How to be used)

To be said over it as a charm.²⁹

Legends of the vignettes are not translated with this 18th dyn. material, since none earlier than the 19th dyn. is included in the writer's examples.

The interconnections of these 23 sections must now be explained. Sections 1-18, in the order 1-4, 6-7, 5, 8-11, 12 end, 12 beginning,

²² I. e., though he could have taken it by force.

²³ On the negative *n* with inf. cf. Gardiner, *Eg. Gram.* § 307: 1, end. This version apparently means that Hardedef turned the spell over to the King without looking at it himself. But cf. the variant given below.

²⁴ The sense here seems to require *tw* as impers. subject, modified by the qualitatives *w'bw* and *twr*.

²⁵ This section is inserted into Ea's text of Spell 137 A (Pl. 57) also, in the midst of other paragraphs of directions.

²⁶ Variant in Spell 30 B: "To be said over."

²⁷ *špdyw* with book-roll. Cf. *kd*, "form," but also *kdy* (with legs), "surround" (*Wb. der äg. Spr.* V. 78).

²⁸ Presumably the scarab rather than the mouth (though both *hpr* and *rj* are masc.), since in the next sentence the former is clearly meant.

²⁹ The "charm" is evidently Spell 30 B, which follows in whole or in part in all the occurrences noted.

13-18, form a unit in the late papyri R and T. Under the 21st dynasty, Spell 148 in Ee shows almost the same arrangement, consisting of §§ 1-4, 6-7, 5, 8-9, and 11-18, while Ec (Pl. CXV) is shorter, with only §§ 1 and 10-13. The 18th dynasty order is given by Ea, which, however, divides this material into two units, §§ 9-18 being placed between Spells 132 and 52 and §§ 1-8 coming much farther along between Spells 141-42 and 133. In two other 18th dynasty papyri (Pc and Ax) Spell 148 is composed of §§ 9, 11-13, and 19-22.³⁰ But §§ 19-23 formed a unit at the end of Spell 64 in Ea (Pls. 44 f.), Ce (Pl. XVI), and Ga; and §§ 22-23 occur together in Spell 30 B.

Naville's Spell 15 B III, a hymn to the setting sun, opens with our §§ 1, 3, and 6, rearranged and suitably expanded as follows:³¹

(§§ 1A and 3A. Title)

Another spell: Secrets of Duat, mysteries of the nether world—(how to) see the Disk when he sets in life in the West, when he is praised by the gods and the spirits in Duat; (how to) make excellent the spirit in the favor of Re, put his might before Atum, magnify him before Osiris, put his power before the Presider over the Westerners, put his augustness before the Ennead of Osiris, the gods who lead Duat; (how to) cleave the mountains and open the valleys; (how to) treat the heart of the spirit, broaden his steps, give him his (powers of) locomotion, do away with his deafness, and restore his sight, along with (the doing of these same things for) the great god who is in his disk.

(§ 6A. Claims)

As for every spirit for whom this roll is used, his soul goes forth with men and gods, it goes forth by day in any form in which it may desire to go forth, it is not kept away from any gate of the West in going in or out, it is mighty among the gods of Duat. He for whom it is used is one whom they cannot repulse. These gods shall escort him, they shall acknowledge him, and he shall be like one of them; he shall go in and out of the secret gates, he shall enter as a mighty one at the gates of the sacred regions; he shall know what happens to him 'in the light', he shall be an excellent spirit. No distinction shall be made between his soul

³⁰ Naville gives only Pc in facsimile. In his *Einleitung*, p. 178, however, he says Pc and Ax are "fast vollständig gleich" and gives "die einzige erwähnenswerthe Variante," which belongs to our § 22.

³¹ Similar intertwining appears, for example, in Spell 30, which in the late version of R and T is built up out of the earlier 30 A and 30 B.

and the god; that is, he shall repulse his enemies, coming in his numerous forms, praising Re at eventide when he sets in life in the Westland.²²

A variant of §§ 19-21 forms the end of Spell 64 in Ca, Ea (Pl. 26), Ce (Pl. IX), etc. The differences are:

(§ 19A. Claims)

... and does all that a man who is on earth does in every respect.

(§ 20A. Account of the Discovery)

This spell was found in a foundation trench of him who is in the *hnw*-bark (i. e. the god Sokar) by the foreman of the wall-builders in the time of the majesty of King Zemiti,²³ deceased.²⁴

(§ 21A. Restriction on Use)

These are secret instructions, unseen, unbeheld. This spell is to be read
....

Internal evidence makes it fairly clear that §§ 22-23 should immediately precede Spell 30 B. There appears no intrinsic connection between this material and Spell 64, though in the manuscripts the latter frequently preceded it, accompanied by §§ 19-21 or their variant. Those sections are appropriate enough to Spell 64, though not out of keeping with Spell 148, and could be followed by § 22 as well in one combination as in the other. It seems strange, however, to find § 23 and Spell 30 B regularly left out of the latter sequence.

Sections 9-18 form a reasonable unit as found in Ea and (with § 10 omitted) in Ce. They or selections from them occur in very diverse situations, except that two 19th dynasty manuscripts (Eb and La) agree in placing them between Spell 110 vignette and Spells 185-86.

But what about §§ 1-8? Since they deal with a "roll," we

²² Spell "15 B III" in Pa contains altogether, except for epithets of the Ennead, only §§ 1, 3, and 6 of the normal type of Spell 148, with some omissions.

²³ On this name cf. Gardiner, *Eg. Gram.*, p. 525, and *Wb. der äg. Spr.* III. 444.

²⁴ Budge, *The Book of the Dead: An English Translation* (London, 1928), pp. 210 f., mentions an 11th dyn. coffin containing two versions of Spell 64, the rubric in one referring to Zemiti, that in the other mistakenly to a Mentuhotep instead of Menkure. The implication is that both our § 20 and its variant § 20A are at least as old as the 11th dyn. In that case these would be the oldest elements of Spell 148 yet known to the writer.

should expect them to introduce not a single spell but a series. This seems, in fact, to be their function. The frequency with which they follow Spells 141-42 (so in Ea, Ce, Ga, Cg, and Ec) is interesting; but the more important matter is to see what spells they precede. Though hit-or-miss placings prevail, three manuscripts continue with Spell 133 and associated spells.⁵⁵ Since these form furthermore the only relatively homogeneous group represented, we may be justified in ending our present quest at this point.

As the foregoing translations make clear, as early as the 18th dynasty the Book of the Dead contained extensive non-magical additions consisting to a noticeable extent of "sales talk." We can only hope that its psychological effect on the would-be beneficiaries of the "patent medicine" spells of ancient Egypt was to bring courage to face the life beyond.



⁵⁵ Ec contains only § 1 of this portion, followed by §§ 10-13, then by Spell 133, with which that papyrus ends. In Ea the succeeding group consists of Spells 133, 136 A, 134, 130, and 131; in Ga, of Spells 133, 135, 136 A, 134, and 101.

THE ORIGIN OF THE THOUGHT-PATTERN WHICH SURVIVES IN BAPTISM

GEORGE A. BARTON
UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

THE ATTENTION of a number of scholars has in recent years been directed to the survival of early thought-patterns in later religious ceremonies and cultural institutions. It is the purpose of this article to trace one such pattern in a way more completely than it has yet been done. The ancient Babylonians believed that water was the spermatozoa of the gods. Its out-pouring each year over the Babylonian alluvium fertilized the earth and caused it to bring forth its fruits, thus giving life to all beings upon it. In order to secure this annual outpouring of the divine life-giving fluid, the liturgy of Babylonian spring-festivals depicted the cohabitation of the god of a city with his spouse; the result was believed to be the abundant outpouring of the life-giving waters. The account of such a union with its outcome is recorded for us by Gudea, the ruler of Lagash, about 2400 B. C. After describing in a realistic way the details of the divine marital union, and how in that union the god "poured out seed," he proceeds, "the great water-courses that were low became like water that bowls will not hold; it stood in the plantations; from the Tigris and the Euphrates it joyfully overflowed; whatever was needed for the city and the temple satisfactorily it caused to grow."¹ A tablet in the Museum of the University of Pennsylvania contains a similar myth concerning the deities Enlil and Ninlil of Nippur. Perhaps that myth formed part of a liturgy for the spring festival at Nippur. Enlil and Ninlil cohabit, as did Ningirsu and Bau at Lagash, and the holy river, which had been dry, flowed again.² Still another tablet found at Nippur records a similar myth concerning the union of Enki and Ninhursag,—a myth the original home of which must have been Eridu. Enki cohabited with the goddess, who yielded to him unwillingly, after which the fields were flooded.³ It is

¹ See Barton, *Royal Inscriptions of Sumer and Akkad*, p. 25 f.

² See Barton, *Miscellaneous Babylonian Inscriptions*, No. 4, especially, p. 36.

³ See Barton, *Archaeology and the Bible*, 6th ed., p. 346; for the lines there omitted, see his article "New Babylonian Material Concerning

probable that this belief as to the source of life-giving water was universal in Babylonia, and that in each locality the gods of the place were accorded the credit of giving it.

Indeed the Babylonian creation epic, which is of considerable antiquity, declares that from the mingling of fresh waters from under the earth, which were male, and salt waters from the sea, which were female, the gods themselves were born.

Primeval Apsu their begetter,
 Roaring Tiamat who bore them,—
 Their waters together were mingled;

 Gods were created between them.⁴

Apsu, the primeval abyss of fresh water, and Tiamat, the salt sea, are in these lines regarded as gods. This conception that there is a difference of sex in water finds expression in the "Parables" of the Jewish apocalypse of I Enoch, where we read (I Enoch 54: 7, 8): "And he will open all the chambers of waters which are above the heavens, and of the fountains which are beneath the earth. And all the waters shall be joined with the waters: that which is above the heavens is masculine, and that which is beneath the earth is feminine." The application had been slightly changed, but belief in the difference of sex had survived.

For other parts of the Semitic area W. Robertson Smith long ago proved that springs were sacred, and were frequently believed to be the residences of deities.⁵ It would follow, then, that their waters also had life-giving potency. There is much evidence in the records of Arabian and Palestinian religion that this was so.

While we have no direct evidence that the Egyptians regarded the waters of the Nile on which the fertility of their land depended as the spermatozoa of the gods, we do know that the Nile was itself regarded as a deity, and that one of the most important of the Egyptian festivals was timed to coincide with the rising of the Nile.⁶ Indeed, the Egyptian calendar was originally arranged so

Creation and Paradise," *American Journal of Theology* XXI, especially p. 581; cf. also Langdon, *Semitic Mythology* 197.

⁴ See *Archæology and the Bible* 287 and any other of the translations cited there.

⁵ *Religion of the Semites* 135 ff.

⁶ Breasted, *Ancient Records, Egypt* I 25 ff. and Foucart in *Hastings' Encyc. of Religion and Ethics* III 97a.

that that rising marked the beginning of the new year. From the Pyramid Texts we learn that the waters of the First Cataract, where the Nile was believed to be born, possessed peculiar cleansing powers. The dead king must be purified by waters from Elephantine before he can go to the sky and take his place among the gods.⁷ At this early period no nation distinguished clearly between the physical and spiritual or moral. That which was physically creative was believed to have creative potency also in what we now call the spiritual realm. This is the *raison d'être* of this earliest recorded ceremony of what is called "ceremonial purification." It was not, from the ancient point of view, ceremonial. It was recreative. He who experienced it was believed to have experienced in some sense a divine rebirth. Breasted pointed out many years ago ⁸ that even in the Pyramid Age moral as well as ceremonial significance was attached to the lustrations in the sacred waters at Elephantine; but at the time he wrote no one realized that it was only centuries later that the human mind grasped the separateness of the ethical from the physical, so as to understand that physical or ceremonial purity does not insure ethical acceptability.⁹

The connection thus established in Egypt between the early belief in the divine nature of water and the regenerating power of lustrations affords us an explanation of similar ceremonies in Babylonia. There also in the time of Nebuchadnezzar II, as we learn from a liturgy for the celebration of the spring festival, the high priest arose hours before sunrise and bathed himself morning after morning in preparation for the performance of his duties in the sacred offices of the coming day.¹⁰ It was, if you please, a ceremonial lustration, but in view of the generative character of water in the thought of the ancient Babylonians, we may be sure that originally the act had a deeper significance. It meant that the priest was born anew,—that new currents of the divinely given life invigorated him for the solemn work of the new day.

Water had the power also to expel demoniac powers. Thus in *Maglu* VII 115-123 we read:

⁷ See K. Sethe, *Die Pyramidentexte* § 864.

⁸ *Development of Religion and Thought in Ancient Egypt* 103 f. and 171.

⁹ G. A. Barton, *Christ and Evolution* 31 ff.

¹⁰ See *Semitic and Hamitic Origins* 279 ff. and the references there given.

"I have washed my hands, I have purified my body,
 With pure spring water which is created in Eridu.
 Whatever is evil, whatever is not good,
 Which is in my body, my flesh, my sinews,
 The evil dread I see, the evil omens which are not good,—

.....

I tread upon it in the street; I cast it aside.

According to one version of the myth of the restoration of the god Osiris to life, he was revived by being washed.¹¹ In Egyptian belief, therefore, the divine waters could give life in every form in which the mind could conceive of it. This belief in the life-giving power of water continued throughout Egyptian history well into the Christian era. Apuleius of Madura, who was born about A. D. 130, relates in his *Metamorphoses*¹² an initiation into the mysteries of the cult of Isis, at the beginning of which the initiate was bathed and sprinkled with water. It is the belief of scholars that this bath was regarded as regenerative.¹³ That it was really understood as a birth into a new and higher life is made clear by a passage in the *Corpus Hermeticum*¹⁴ which dates from the third Christian century, in which Hermes explains to Tat that God filled a great basin with mind and let it down to earth, that he has caused to be proclaimed to men that they dip themselves in this basin, that those who do so get a share of mind and become complete men, that those who fail to do so have speech only, and never become real men. The whole figure is based on an ancient custom of immersion in water for the purpose of obtaining birth into a higher life. It is a spiritual interpretation of an old physical custom which must still have survived in Egyptian heathenism or it could not have been figuratively employed. Another passage (*Corpus* I. 29) contains a figure of similar import: "I sowed them the teachings of wisdom; and that which I sowed was watered with water of immortal life." Thus from the beginning and the end of Egyptian his-

¹¹ Cf. A. M. Blackman in *Recueil de travaux relatifs à la philologie et à l'archéologie égyptiennes et assyriennes* XXX 49 (1920) and in *Myth and Ritual* edited by Hooke, p. 16.

¹² XI 23.

¹³ Cf. H. R. Willoughby, *Pagan Regeneration*, p. 87 f.

¹⁴ IV 4.

tory as from the beginning and end of Babylonian history, we have evidence of belief in the power of water as a divine agency for the renewal and the rebirth of life.¹⁵ At first in both countries it was applied quite materialistically, but in Egypt, at least, it was in time spiritualized.

The same cycle of primitive ideas concerning the powers of water prevailed in Israel, though their expression was modified, as time passed, by the exaltation of Yahweh brought about by the development of monotheism. As in Babylonia, primeval chaos is a mass of water,—a conception which, as has long been recognized, is a Hebrew adaptation of the Babylonian conception. This water is closely associated with Yahweh, for in the days before the creative process began his Spirit (or wind) broods over it (Gen. 1:1-2). That this water had peculiar cleansing and life-giving potency is made clear by its use in certain rituals which were designed to avert from the community the consequences of crime. Thus in Deut. 21:4, to expiate the crime of the unknown murderer of a man found dead in a field, the neck of a heifer must be broken in a valley where there is running water. So also in Lev. 14:5 and 50, if a man had had leprosy and it had left him, or if a plague had visited a house and departed, to insure the man or the house against the return of the disease, a bird must be slain over running water. Still more potently is the belief in the life-giving potency of water brought out in the story of the curing of the leprosy of Naaman the Syrian by Elisha in II Kings 5. When Naaman had bathed seven times in the waters of the Jordan "his flesh came again like unto the flesh of a little child, and he was clean," (v. 14). Naaman had bathed in Yahweh's life-giving waters and had experienced a new birth; "his flesh came again as the flesh of a little child." We do not need to suppose that, in the manner of the Babylonians, the Hebrews now thought of the waters of the Jordan as Yahweh's spermatozoa, or that they regarded the Jordan as a god as the Egyptians did the Nile, but it is clear that they did believe that its waters had regenerative power and that, because the river was the river of Yahweh's land, that power came from Yahweh. Naaman's question, "Are not Abanah and Pharpar,

¹⁵ Tertullian declares that the mysteries of Eleusis and Mithra practised similar lustrations; cf. *De Baptismo* 5 and *Prescrip. Her.* 40. Doubtless this was the case, but for our present purpose we do not need to explore these cults.

rivers of Damascus, better than all the waters of Israel; may I not wash in them, and be clean?" (v. 12) indicates that the Aramæans of Damascus entertained similar views with reference to the life-giving potency of the waters of their rivers, a potency which they doubtless attributed to Hadad. The superiority of Yahweh and his river to Hadad and his rivers, in healing power, led Naaman to desire to make a little Palestine in Damascus in which he could worship Yahweh (vv. 17 ff.). When understood against the background of Hamito-Semitic thought on this subject, this story of the cure of Naaman becomes as significant as the Egyptian story of the revivification of Osiris by bathing. It is a witness to the perpetuity in Israel of the primitive belief in the life-giving and recreative powers of water.

That this early thought-pattern persisted throughout Hebrew history, is shown by numerous passages in the various strata of Israel's laws and narratives. In Exodus 19: 10, in preparation for Yahweh's appearance to the people at Sinai, the people were required to bathe in water. This is analogous to the bathing of the Babylonian high priest. In Ex. 30: 18 a laver is to be placed in the sanctuary in which priests can wash. In Leviticus 13 and 14 the effects of various plagues may be banished by water. In Lev. 22: 6 uncleanness is to be removed by water. In Lev. 17: 16 bathing in water puts away the sin of having eaten the flesh of an animal that died without being bled. In Num. 31: 21-24 spoils taken from the Midianites are purified by being washed. Apparently by washing they were reborn as native to Israel and their foreign uncleanness vanished. Hitherto, so far as I know, no adequate explanation of the reason for the "diverse washings" (as phrased in Heb. 9: 10) of the Old Testament has ever been offered. The recognition of the survival of this early Semitic and Hamitic thought-pattern explains their significance and reveals that they all arose from one underlying principle.

The recognition of the survival of this ancient thought-pattern explains another Jewish custom, of which I have never seen an explanation that really explained. I refer to the custom of immersing proselytes on receiving them into Judaism. The earliest reference to the rite in the Mishna is in *Pesāḥim* viii, 8, where the recipients of baptism were non-Jewish soldiers. The origin of the rite and the reason for its existence was then unknown. Gavin says, "When the authorities of the Talmud have to do with this

Mishna their recorded opinions show how the clue to the origin and significance of the rite lay outside their ken."¹⁶ The rite was, however, most important. In *Yebāmōth* 46a two rabbis gravely discuss whether baptism or circumcision is the more important for a proselyte. Two accounts of the Jewish ritual for the reception of proselytes have come down to us: one in *Yebāmōth* 47, and the other in the extra-canonical Talmudic tract *Gērīm*. The rituals in the two sources differ slightly, but the kernel is in both cases the same. Gavin has translated the pertinent parts of the two in parallel columns.¹⁷ *Yebāmōth* gives the meaning of the rite in the words, "He immerses himself and when he comes up he is in all respects an Israelite."¹⁸ He who was a gentile has, like Naaman and the Midianitish spoils in Num. 31, been born again. It is a perpetuation of the primitive thought-pattern concerning the generative and regenerative power of water.

John the Baptist was a Jew. He came preaching "the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins." His words were, "Repent ye; for the kingdom is at hand" (Mark 1:4; Matt. 3:2). "And there went out unto him all the country of Judæa, and all they of Jerusalem; and they were baptized of him in the river Jordan, confessing their sins" (Mark 1:5). Why were they baptized? Why was not confession sufficient? Evidently, in the light of the information we have gathered, because their old sinful selves had to be replaced through the birth of a new character, that they might be persons fitted to be citizens of the approaching kingdom of God. John's ministry perpetuated the old thought-pattern.

Jesus continued the ministry of the kingdom, and, though he himself did not baptize (see John 4:2) his disciples did, and baptism became a Christian rite. It was required of converts in the early Apostolic Age (Acts 2:41; 8:36-38; 10:48; 19:5), and later tradition attributed the command to baptize to the risen Jesus (Matt. 28:19; Mark 16:16). It should be noted that the thought that life-giving water proceeds from God finds expression also in the New Testament Book of Revelation, one of the most Jewish of the New Testament books. In Rev. 22:1 we read, "And he showed me a river of water of life, bright as crystal, proceeding out of the throne of God and of the Lamb."

Passing over the earliest patristic writings, we find in Tertul-

¹⁶ *The Jewish Antecedents of the Christian Sacraments* 31.

¹⁷ *Op. cit.* 32 ff.

¹⁸ *Yeb.* 47b.

lian's *de Baptismo*, a clear statement of how baptism was regarded by Christians at the end of the second century. It would seem that, while Christianity was confined to Palestine, baptism could be performed in any of its waters because all its waters were regarded as surcharged with efficacious power. By the time of Tertullian, however, doubts seem to have arisen as to whether baptisms in non-Palestinian water were as efficacious,—whether those whom Peter baptized in the Tiber were as genuinely baptized as those baptized by John in the Jordan, or the eunuch whom Philip “baptized in chance waters,” (Acts 8:36). Tertullian meets the situation by maintaining that, just as the Spirit of God brooded over the waters of chaos at the beginning, so he is always brooding over water, and that the Spirit again sanctifies them when at baptism he is invoked by the one officiating. “Thus the nature of the waters, sanctified by the Holy One, itself conceived withal the power of sanctifying.”¹⁹ That this “sanctification” was considered to be a new birth, is shown by a passage in Tertullian's *De Corona*²⁰ which states that just after baptism initiates are made to taste a mixture of milk and honey,—the first food given to new-born children. Thus the doctrine of baptismal regeneration was, by the perpetuation of this ancient thought-pattern, thus modified, established in the Christian Church, where it still persists. Although by many Christians it has doubtless been held in a crassly materialistic form, and perhaps still is, the official statements concerning it have generally emphasized the function of the Holy Spirit in accomplishing the work. In the historic churches, however, the use of water, properly administered with the appropriate words, has been regarded as absolutely essential. A Thomas Aquinas may seem to put the emphasis on the spiritual, but the Roman doctrine as stated by the Council of Trent is thus summarized by Pohle: It “regarded regeneration as fundamentally nothing else than justification acquired through sacramental baptism.”²¹ To trace the ramifications of the doctrine is beyond the scope of the present article.²² Our purpose has been to exhibit the thought-pattern of which it is a survival.

¹⁹ *De Baptismo* 4.

²⁰ Ch. 3.

²¹ See *The Catholic Encyclopedia* XII 715.

²² See Hastings' *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics* II. 390-400; X. 647b, 648a; and the articles “Baptism,” “Regeneration,” and “Waters” in *The Catholic Encyclopedia*.

In the various forms of the Anglican communion the baptismal ritual perpetuates this primitive thought-pattern with various modification. In the *Book of Common Prayer* of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States as revised in 1928 an attempt is made to keep the old forms and at the same time to rob them of crass materialism, and bring them into harmony with modern knowledge. The result is, so far at least as infant baptism is concerned, some apparent inconsistencies. Thus, near the beginning of the service, the minister prays, "Sanctify this water to the mystical washing away of sin, and grant that this thy child, now to be baptised therein, may receive the fullness of thy grace, and ever remain in the number of thy faithful children."²³ In the catechism, published under the same cover, it is implied that infants, because they cannot repent and renounce the devil, are bound by their "sureties" or "sponsors" to do this later.²⁴ It would appear, accordingly, that infants are really not regenerated until later. Nevertheless in the baptismal service itself the minister is directed to say, after the baptism has actually been performed, "Seeing now, dearly beloved brethren, that this child is regenerate,"²⁵ etc. The keeping of the ancient formula, while recognizing that it is not literally true, is eloquent testimony to the power of this ancient thought-pattern, which comes from hoary antiquity, hallowed by sacred associations.

Since Mohammedanism, the third religion which sprung from the ancient Semitic stock, had neither priesthood nor doctrine of regeneration, one could hardly expect to find in it survivals of this ancient conception of the divine, life-giving power of water. Such survivals are not, however, wholly wanting. In the Koran (5: 8, 9) we read, "O ye who believe, when ye stand for prayer, wash your faces and your hands unto the elbows and rub your heads and your feet unto the ankles. And if you are polluted, then you become clean. And if you are sick or on a journey or one of you comes from the privy or contact with women and you cannot find water, then perform the ablution with good earth and rub your faces and hands with it." Mohammed, who was born in Arabian heathenism, still felt that man should be purified with this divinely surcharged element before he approached God in prayer. The provision permitting the ablution to be made with earth or sand was a concession because of the scarcity of water in Arabia.

²³ P. 279.²⁴ P. 577.²⁵ P. 280.

Another survival appears in the ritual prescribed for the devotions of pilgrims at the Kaaba at Mecca. It is well known that these rites were taken over from ancient Arabian heathenism. Before the pilgrim approaches the great mosque and the Kaaba in order to circumambulate them, he must perform an ablution,²⁶ and after the seven circuits are completed, he goes and drinks of the waters of the well Zemzem,²⁷ sacred from a time far earlier than Mohammed.²⁸ Thus on Islam as well as on Judaism and Christianity this primitive thought-pattern has left its mark.

Water-gods, water-spirits, and rites of purification by water are found in most of the ethnic religions. This points to a close association of water with deity in the human mind everywhere, but the desert environment of the Hamitic and Semitic peoples gave this conception an intensity in their minds that I have been unable to trace elsewhere. This intensity would account for its wide survival.

In conclusion a word should be said about the difference between the origin of Christian baptism set forth above and that set forth by R. Reitzenstein in his *Vorgeschichte der christlichen Taufe*, Leipzig and Berlin, 1929. Reitzenstein holds that the rite of baptism was native to the Persians and Aryans of India, and that it was practised in the Soma-rite of the last mentioned country. He further urges that Cyrus planted the cult of the Persian goddess Anāhita in Lydia, and that Artaxerxes II planted it in all the chief cities of the Persian empire including Damascus, and that Damascus is so near the sources of the Jordan that the custom of baptizing in the Jordan was adopted from the Anāhita-cult of Damascus and was later adopted by John the Baptist. He finds evidence of the knowledge of baptismal regeneration in Philo, and discusses its practice among the Mandæans, Manichæans, and Cathari. He finds also a number of evidences of Persian influence among the Mandæans, and traces to Persian Anāhita-baptism the whole baptismal conception in the West wherever found.

When one appreciates the facts set forth in the preceding pages, this whole conception of Reitzenstein's is most artificial and improbable. Had he known Babylonian and Egyptian material as well as he knows Persian and Indian, the materials which lie before

²⁶ See Eldon Rutter, *The Holy Cities of Arabia* I 106.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 111.

²⁸ Cf. *Hebraica* X 62 ff.; *Semitic Origins* 236; and *Semitic and Hamitic Origins* 217.

him in the Old Testament would not have been to him a sealed book. In the interest of his theory he denies that immersion is referred to in *Sybilline Oracles* IV 152-192, but to one not under the spell of a theory, lines 164-169 of this passage seem as clearly to point to baptism as the language of the Soma-ritual. The high table-land of Iran was in part a continuation of the dessicated strip which constitutes the Saharah and Arabian Deserts. Rain and snow fall on the Persian mountains and create a number of rivers, but only a few of these reach the sea. The water is absorbed by the thirsty soil. Irrigation is necessary for the cultivation of the fields and the sustenance of life. Doubtless, water was in Persia connected with the life-giving goddess Anāhita and baptismal rites were doubtless as native there as in the Hamito-Semitic countries. We can, however, trace the ideas in Babylonia and Egypt centuries before the Aryan Persians entered Iran, and, as we have shown above, the conceptions were present among the Hebrews much earlier than the probable time of Zoroaster. The Hebrew people were descended from a stock whose ancestors had entertained from before the dawn of history the ideas concerning the life-giving power of water. To suppose that this people needed to borrow these same ideas from Persia, through the artificial channel of Damascus, and a foreign cult abhorrent to them, is quite gratuitous. The valid parts of Reitzenstein's discussion set forth the later portions of that *Vorgeschichte*, the far earlier reaches of which have been given in outline above.

FOUR EGYPTIAN INSCRIBED STATUETTES OF THE MIDDLE KINGDOM

LUDLOW BULL

METROPOLITAN MUSEUM OF ART
NEW YORK

THE FOUR statuettes here dealt with were bought for the Metropolitan Museum in 1910 by Winlock from Muḥammad Muḥassib of Luxor. Winlock was given to understand that they came from the necropolis of the ancient *Kȳs* near the modern village of Mir (Meir), but circumstances mentioned below suggest that they probably came from *Sṣw.ty* (modern Asyūt), capital of the adjoining nome and thirty miles further up the Nile. Both sites lay within the concession to excavate granted by the Egyptian government in 1910 to Sayyid Bey (later Pāshā) Khashabeh of Asyūt.¹ As to date, the type and size of the figures and the cursive hieroglyphic of the inscriptions both point to the early Middle Kingdom, while the name of the owner's father(?), *Yt(.y)-ib(.y)*, is known only in that period so far as I have been able to discover.² It is interesting that so far as the place of residence of possessors of the name is known it is Asyūt in each case. Coffins of two individuals of the name were found by Chassinat and Palanque at that site³ in 1903. In the season 1913-14 Aḥmad Bey Kamāl, excavating there for Sayyid Bey Khashabeh, found a statuette bearing the name.⁴ The individual in question is probably not the same as either of those whose coffins were found 10 years earlier. In the same season Aḥmad Bey seems to have found at Asyūt a coffin of still a fourth individual of this name. This is now in the Municipal Museum of Tanṭā.⁵ In addition there is the nomarch of the name whose tomb is no. 3 at Asyūt.⁶ Mariette found two stelae at Abydos on which the name occurs as that of a relation of the deceased.⁷ In one case the man in whose honor the stela was

¹ Blackman, *Rock Tombs of Meir* I 14.

² Ranke, *Personennamen* 50, no. 14; Chassinat-Palanque, *Campagne de fouilles dans la nécropole d'Assiout* 123 f. and 191 ff. See below, note 23.

³ Chassinat-Palanque, *loc. cit.*

⁴ *Annales du Service* XVI (1916). 101.

⁵ Gauthier and Lefebvre, *Annales du Service* XXIII (1923). 19.

⁶ Porter and Moss, *Topographical Bibliography* IV. 263.

⁷ Lange and Schäfer, *Grab- und Denksteine des mittleren Reichs*, nos. 20235 and 20338.

erected seems actually to have had a tomb, or at least a cenotaph, at Abydos. But that does not settle the question of the place of residence of the family concerned, for residents of other towns were of course occasionally buried at the holy city and often erected monuments there. In the case of the other Abydos stela Mariette makes no mention of a tomb.⁸ De Buck has had the kindness to examine briefly the photographs of these statuettes and my copies and has noticed several phrases that were familiar to him from his study of the Middle Kingdom coffins. These phrases all appear on coffins from Asyūt and I have not yet found that they occur elsewhere.

The owner of the statuettes was a man named Merer who bore the title "scribe of the divine offerings." This name is not uncommon in the Middle Kingdom, but rarer later. It has been found at Asyūt,⁹ Denderah, and other sites.¹⁰

On all four statuettes the short kilts are built up of gesso on which cursive hieroglyphic inscriptions were written in ink. The finger- and toe-nails of the figures are shown in white. The bases of the statuettes are painted red. On the top of each base is a short incised inscription giving the title and name of the deceased. Here the hieroglyphs and border lines have been colored with dark blue-green paint on a white background. The same green paint has been used on the kilt-tabs of II and III and for the inscriptions on the girdles of all four figures. The latter inscriptions are not incised and the paint has run, making some of the signs difficult to recognize.

I

This is the largest¹¹ and the best preserved of the four statuettes, as well as the finest from the point of view of workmanship. The body is painted brownish red.

The inscription on the base: *ʾIm³hy sš ḥtp-nṯr Mrr m³-ḥrw*. "The honored one, the scribe of divine offerings, M., justified."

The girdle inscription (beginning on the front near the sinister side): *ʾIm³ḥ sš ḥtp-nṯr Mrr m³-ḥrw im³hy ḥr Smy.t(?) ³ḥ.t mry nṯr.f(?) nw.ty*. "The honored one, the scribe of divine offerings,

⁸ Mariette, *Cat. d'Abydos* 303, no. 883; 268, no. 821.


⁹ Ahmed Bey Kemal, *Annales du Service* XVI (1916). 109, no. 136.

¹⁰ Ranke, *Personennamen* 162, no. 17.

¹¹ Museum no. 10. 176. 59. Height 35.3 cm.

M., justified; honored by the holy Necropolis¹² (personified), beloved of his(?)¹³ city god."

The text on the kilt of this figure is the only one of the four that is written partly in horizontal lines:



Translation: (1) "Go down, O Osiris¹⁴ M., justified and possessor of honor, (2) that thou mayst join the earth (in burial) and also guide¹⁵ the Evening bark and the Morning bark¹⁶ (of the Sun-god). (3) The Necropolis gives her arms to thee¹⁷ that thou mayst follow¹⁸ upon the beautiful ways (4) on which¹⁹ the

¹² Cf. Chassinat-Palanque, *op. cit.* 20, 22. I owe this suggested reading and the reference to de Buck.

¹³ De Buck notes that the pronoun would be expected, as in Chassinat-Palanque 20, 21. The place for *f* would be over the town-sign and following *mry ntr*, but the remains of the sign there are scarcely legible.

¹⁴ The determinative has no beard in the original. This is the form regularly used by the scribe of these statuettes. Cf. I 12(?); II 1, 9, 11; III 1, 9, 10. The only exception seems to be the det. of *sm̄ḥ.w* in I 4. It is possible that the first word of the text is the vocative interjection *h̄* (to which the det. legs are occasionally added. Gardiner, *Grammar* § 87 and *Suppl.* 3) and not the verb *h̄zy*. In that case we should read: "Ho, Osiris M., . . . , thou shalt join," etc.

¹⁵ This would seem to be the transitive use of *ḡzy* with the boat as object (Erman and Grapow *Wörterbuch* V 512, An). De Buck notes the use of the phrase *sm̄ḥ t̄* followed by *ḡzy* in Asyūt texts otherwise different from this, e.g. Chassinat-Palanque 15, 79, 125. Cf. also *Annales du Service XXIII* (1923). p. 20.

¹⁶ I know of no other example of this *m*-like form of the 'nd-sign.

¹⁷ More literally: "places her hands upon thee," in view of the preposition. De Buck notes similar phrases in Chassinat-Palanque 15, 79, 125. The sign for the verb *dy* in these texts is the same as that for the word "arm" and I have therefore transcribed both with the same sign.

¹⁸ The *t* with *šm̄s* seems to be a mere space-filler, common in later times over this determinative. This could not well be the *t*-form of the verb. This *t* seems to occur frequently in Asyūt texts to which de Buck refers me for parallels to this clause. See Chassinat-Palanque 12, 21, 26, 138. See also *Annales du Service XXIII* (1923). p. 20.

¹⁹ *š* for *šn*, as not rarely with feminine nouns.

revered ones [pass],²⁰ and that thou mayst take possession of²¹ (5) thy divine seat in Ḥat-Weru.²² The revered one, the scribe, of divine offerings, M., born to Yot(y)-ib(y), possessor of²³

II

This figure²⁴ was colored with black paint mixed with red, producing a dark tone.

The inscription on the base: "The revered one, the scribe of divine offerings, M., the excellent (*ikr*).²⁵

The girdle inscription (beginning on the sinister side): *Im̃hy sš htp-ntr, M., im̃hy hr Wšyr(?) hr Inpw hr Hnm(?)*.²⁶ "The revered one, the scribe of divine offerings, M., honored by Osiris(?), by Anubis, and by Hnūm(?)."

²⁰ In the similar Asyūt texts referred to in note 18 the verb missing here is again *šms*. The trace at the bottom of the line may perhaps belong to the *šms*-sign.

²¹ Reading *šsp*. The sign as made resembles *s*₃. I owe the reading to Gardiner. He has not, however, studied these texts and is not responsible for faults in the present article.

²² "House of the Great Oxen." An ancient place, associated with the obsequies of Osiris, probably near Buto in the N. W. Delta. Sethe, *Übersetz. u. Komment. zu d. altäg. Pyramidentexten* I 95.


²³ I am not wholly satisfied as to the gender of the parent mentioned here. All the individuals of the name known to me were men, but this name might be given to a woman. The determinative here, so far as it has survived, resembles a female figure, but it resembles just as closely the form of the revered male figure generally used by this scribe (see note 14 above). If this person were a woman one would expect to find a *t* under the *n*-sign at the bottom of line 12, but the trace there I think is clearly the end of the tail of the *f* in line 11. On the other hand *ms n* is not exactly the form one would expect to find in the filiation of this period preceding a father's name (see Gardiner, *Grammar*, Suppl. 12, *re* p. 296, and references there). On the whole, however, I am inclined to believe that the father is mentioned here. One might expect *nb im̃h* to follow the name, but the reed-sign below the lacuna is puzzling. This, barely visible in the photograph, is a complete and carefully made hieroglyphic sign. It might possibly be a careless copying from hieratic of a stroke under the *im̃h*-sign.

²⁴ Museum no. 10. 176. 58. Height, 33.5 cm.

²⁵ This epithet following the name of the deceased is common at Asyūt. Chassinat-Palauque 32, note 3. Its use suggests a date not later than the early XII Dynasty. Polotsky, *Zu den Inschriften der 11. Dynastie*, § 81a.

²⁶ The phrase *hr Wšyr* is very uncertain. The sign which I have read *Hnm* I take to be a seated ram-headed deity.

The text on the kilt of this figure alone is in red ink. It is in vertical lines as are those of III and IV, and begins on the front at the sinister side:



Translation: (1) "O Osiris M., (2) come²⁷ with me²⁸ (3) and I will open (4) for thee thine eyes, (5) that they may lead thee (6) on²⁹ the ways of darkness (7) and that they may put fear (8) of thee into the Imperishable (9) Ones, as (10) did Horus³⁰ for his father Osiris. (11) The revered one M."

III

This figure³¹ was painted a dark tone similar to that of II. The inscription on the base: "The revered one, the scribe of divine offerings, M., the excellent."³²

The girdle inscription begins on the back near the sinister side: *Sš ḥtp-nṯr M. m³-ḥrw nb im³ḥ, im³ḥy*³³ *ḥr Wśyr*³⁴ *nb 'Imn.t.*³⁵

²⁷ Followed by *n.k*, the "ethical dative." The handle of *k* is at the right here. Elsewhere it is at the left, except in the corresponding word in III. It is always separated from the body of the sign.

²⁸ I know of no other example of this use of the preposition *ḥr*. It seems to be another case where *ḥr* can be used alternatively with *ḥn'*, as in co-ordination (Gardiner, *Grammar* § 91).

²⁹ That is "when thou goest on," etc.

³⁰ Lit. "like that which Horus did."

³¹ Museum no. 10. 176. 60. Height, 33 cm.

³² The *ḥtp*-sign in the title is a mere horizontal rectangle without the loaf. In the last word the cutter of the inscription has omitted the first consonant, writing *ḥr* only.

³³ The ending is indicated by one reed only. Cf. Kemal, *Annales du Service* XVI. 101.

³⁴ The determinative must be intended for the seated divine figure.

³⁵ De Buck calls my attention to the use of this epithet of Osiris in Asyūt inscriptions, e. g. Chassinat-Palanque, pp. 9 and 27.

"The scribe of divine offerings, M. justified, possessor of honor; honored by Osiris, lord of the West."

The text on the kilt is almost identical with that of II and is somewhat better preserved. The only essential difference is the substitution of h.w "spirits," in line 9 for the im.w-sk of II 8-9. A hieroglyphic transcription therefore seems unnecessary: (1) *Wsy* *Mrr* (2) *pn my* (3) *n.k*³⁸ *hr.y* (4) *wn.y n.k* (5) *yr.ty.k ššm.sn* (6) *lw m w³.wt* (7) *lkw dy.* (8) *šn šnd.k m*³⁷ (9) h.w *my* (10) *ir.t.n Hr n yt.f Wsy*.

IV

This statuette³⁸ is considerably smaller than the other three. The color of the figure is a brownish red similar to that of I. The left fore-arm, which projected forward, has been broken off.

Of the inscription on the base only the beginning is legible: "The revered one, the [scribe] of divine . . ."

The girdle inscription begins on the sinister side: *Sš htp-ntr*³⁹ *M. imšhy hr ntr.w*⁴⁰ *mr nw.t.f twt(.t)*.⁴¹ "The scribe of divine offerings, M., honored by the gods and beloved of his whole city."

The text on the kilt begins on the front near the sinister side:



³⁸ On the form of the sign cf. note 27 above.

³⁷ The stroke following *m* is apparently merely a space-filler.

³⁸ Museum no. 10. 176. 57. Height, 23.5 cm.

³⁹ The compound is perhaps followed by plural strokes in a vertical ligature.

⁴⁰ The word *ntr* seems to be followed by the plural strokes in a horizontal ligature.

⁴¹ I owe the reading of the last phrase to de Buck who cites Chassinat-Palanque 127 and 199. The feminine termination, perhaps naturally enough in view of the two *t*'s in the stem of the word, seems often to be omitted in this phrase.

Translation: (1) "O Os[iris Me]rer, (2) [the justified],⁴² (3) possessor of honor . . .,⁴³ (4) one honored and beloved (5) of his [whole] ⁴⁴ city, (6) and favored of his nome(?)⁴⁵ (7) in its entirety. [... Enter (?) shalt] ⁴⁶ (8) thou in ⁴⁷ the august ⁴⁸ bark (9) and thou shalt go forth ⁴⁹ in the divine bark. (10) The revered one [the scribe] (11) of divine offerings M., (12), the excellent, the justified, the possessor of honor."

Three uninscribed statuettes found by Chassinat and Palanque at Asyūt are of interest for comparison with those here described. They are published in the report of their work by these gentlemen (cited above note 2) pp. 48-9, nos. 5 and 6, and plate XII, nos. 1 and 2; also p. 49, no. 8, and plate XI, no. 1, the smallest figure at the right.

I do not know at present of any inscribed statuettes of this type and period except those here described, and I should be glad to be informed of others which may exist in museums or private collections.

⁴² The restorations in lines 1 and 2 are practically certain because of the context.

⁴³ The word *lkr* may perhaps have been in this lacuna.

⁴⁴ I owe this restoration to de Buck, who cites Chassinat-Palanque 127 and 199.


⁴⁵ The sign after *hgy n* is partly destroyed, but in view of Chassinat-Palanque 9 and 127, cited by de Buck, the reading *sp.t* seems extremely likely. The scribe seems to have omitted the feminine *t*.

⁴⁶ Part of a sign is visible after *my kḏ.š* but I do not recognize it. It seems likely that in the lacuna there was some such word as *k*, enter, to correspond with *pry* in line 9.

⁴⁷ I read this as the compound *m-hnw*, meaning here simply "in," in the sense of "on board of." This involves reading the following word as *dp.t* written with the boat-sign. It is just possible that we have here the word *mḥnty*, "ferry-boat," but in this period it is unlikely that the ending *ty* would not have been written in some way.

⁴⁸ Reading *šps.t*. This must be a designation of the boat of the sun-god in parallelism with *dp.t-ntr* in the following clause.

⁴⁹ For the unusual omission of the complementary *r* in the verb *pry* see Erman and Grapow, *Wörterbuch* I 518.





Back



Front

I



Back



Front

II



Front



Back

III



Back



Front

IV

NOTE ON SOME OLD SQUEEZES FROM EGYPTIAN MONUMENTS

DOWS DUNHAM

MUSEUM OF FINE ARTS, BOSTON

THE MUSEUM OF FINE ARTS in Boston owns a number of squeezes made many years ago in Egypt, and given to it partly in 1878 and partly in 1886 by private benefactors. There are no records to show when or by whom these squeezes were made, nor were they accompanied by detailed evidence for identification. The date of receipt constitutes a *terminus ante quem*, and the possibility that some of the monuments thus recorded may have been lost or damaged in the interval has made it a scientific obligation



FIG. 1. Boston Squeeze 78.152.

to examine the material with a view to determining whether it includes anything at present unknown or inadequately recorded. The subjects have been found for the most part to be familiar and already published: the few exceptions to this general rule must serve as the justification for printing this notice.

The squeezes fall into two groups, of which the first was acquired in 1878, and consists of impressions made in the Old Kingdom tombs at Sakkara, and from monuments in the Egyptian Museum, Cairo.

24 squeezes of details in the Tomb of Ptah-hotep; all published.

7 squeezes of details in the Tomb of Ty; all published.

4 squeezes of details in the Tomb of Akhet-hetep-her (since removed to Leiden); all published.

- 19 squeezes from monuments in the Egyptian Museum, Cairo; adequately published with the following exceptions.
- 78.145 and 147¹ Five squeezes of relief details and one of inscription from the sarcophagus of Wennofer; Ptolemaic. Referred to in Maspero, *Guide* (1915), p. 271, No. 1308. Not included in Maspero, *Sarcophages des Époques persane et ptolémaïque*.
- 78.149 Old Kingdom relief from Sakkara. Men in a papyrus skiff and cattle fording a canal. Referred to in Maspero, *Guide* (1915), p. 86, No. 232 E. No published illustration known to me.
- 78.152 Old Kingdom relief, Cairo Inv. 1562. Long stone of which the left half, depicting mat-making, plucking and roasting birds, and two peasants with their dogs, is published by Wreszinski in *Atlas* I, Pl. 397. The right half is a scene of drying fish, and the squeeze shows considerable deterioration of the surface. Whether this part of the stone has since become illegible or not, it has, as far as I know, not been published. It is reproduced in Figure 1.
- 78.164 Relief from Sakkara, V Dynasty. Scene of bird snaring with fine details of plants surrounding the snare. Cairo Museum, ground floor, Corridor A. Figure 2.
- 78.181 and 183 Two details of relief from the sarcophagus of Horemheb, XXX Dynasty. Referred to in Maspero, *Guide* (1915), p. 271, No. 1306. Not included in Maspero, *Sarcophages etc.*

The second group of squeezes was given to the Museum in 1886 and consists of 58 items, grouped as follows:

- 30 squeezes from the Tomb of Kha'emhet (No. 57) at Thebes.
- 1 squeeze from the Temple of Dêr el Medineh (cartouche of Ptolemy IV).
- 7 squeezes from the Temple of Esneh, identified from Jéquier, *Temples Ptolémaïques et Romains*.
- 19 squeezes from the Tomb of Seti I at Thebes, identified from Lefébure, *Hypogées Royaux* I.
- 1 squeeze of an unidentified head of a king, New Kingdom.

Of this group the only squeezes which appear to call for more detailed reference are those from the Tomb of Kha'emhet, a number of which show the reliefs to have been in better condition when the impressions were taken than they now are, and some record scenes which are now wholly or partially lost, and of which no other record appears to exist. In studying the Kha'emhet material the authorities of the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York have been kind enough to allow me to examine a set of photographs recently taken by Mr. Harry Burton in the tomb, and these are referred to in the following list of the squeezes for purposes of identification.

¹ Boston Museum Registration Numbers.

For convenience in assigning the squeezes to their proper positions in the tomb, reference is made to the plan published by Porter and Moss in their *Topographical Bibliography I, The Theban Necropolis*, p. 88, and also to that given by Loret in his article on the tomb in *Mem. Miss. Arch.* I, p. 113 ff. A report on these squeezes, with photographs, was sent to the Department of Antiquities, Cairo, in the winter of 1936, and Mr. Guy Brunton took the photographs to the tomb and has been able to identify several, the location of which had not been apparent from the published records. The information he has been good enough to supply is embodied in the list which follows. The Kha'emhet squeezes are all numbered 86. 213 on the Boston records, with letters designating the individual sheets.




FIG. 2. Boston Squeeze 78.164.

- A. Head of Kha'emhet, facing L. A cast of this head, now in the tomb, replaces the original which is in Berlin. *Ann. Serv.* XIV, p. 89, Pl. I. [3] on plan, Porter & Moss. Burton's photo. T 811 shows the cast in position.
- B. Five men and six cattle, facing R. No change. Wreszinski, *Atlas* I, Pl. 206. Burton, T 819. [10] on plan, Porter & Moss.
- C. Chair and floral pieces, facing R. No change. *Atlas* I, Pl. 209. Burton, T 843. [17] on plan, Porter & Moss.
- D. Standing goddess behind Osiris, facing L. No change. *Atlas* I, Pl. 211. Burton, T 840. [15] on plan, Porter & Moss.
- E. Standing man before table of offerings, facing L. (Adjacent to Squeeze AA) Loret's plan, I, m (p. 121), as proved by the inscriptions, which correspond with the ends of columns 1 to 4 and the left half of column 5. Plate Ib. Squeeze AA comes from above the same door to the left of E. There were opposed scenes here: on the left Isis, Osiris, table of offerings, man in adoration; on the right Nephthys,

Osiris, etc. Squeeze AA gives the Osiris and Isis of the left scene, and part of Nephthys from that on the right. Squeeze E gives the offering table and man from the right scene.

- F. Man pouring libation, facing L. No change. Burton, T 844. [17] on plan, Porter & Moss.
- G. Men bearing furniture, facing R (contiguous to squeeze T). Squeeze more complete than present condition. Burton, T 839. Loret's plan, II, S. wall, E. half. Plate I d.
- H. Two rooms with men offering, facing L.; offering-bearers, facing R.; men rowing, facing L. 3 registers. Squeeze more complete than Loret's plate² and Burton's photo. Loret, Pl. IV. Burton, T 840. Loret's plan, II, S. wall, W. half.
- I. Part of 8 columns text (contiguous to L and N). No change. Loret, inscription q, lines 4-11.
- J. Part of 16 columns text (contiguous to K). No change. Burton, T 849. Loret's plan, III, S. end of W. wall.
- K. Part of 11 columns text (contiguous to J). No change. See J above.
- L. Part of 10 columns text (contiguous to I and N). No change. See I above (lines 2-11).
- M. Part of 11 columns text and a large hand. More complete than when recorded by Loret (inscription g, p. 119). [9] on plan, Porter & Moss. The portion to the left of diagonal fracture line is now missing and was gone when Loret recorded it.² Plate II a.
- N. Part of 7 columns text (contiguous to I and L). No change. See I above (lines 4-10).
- O. Part of 5 columns text (contiguous to CC). No change. Loret, inscription o, lines 3-7.
- P. Large head, facing R. Present gash in face absent on squeeze. *Atlas I*, Pl. 189. Burton, T 832. [13] on plan, Porter & Moss.
- Q. Large head with triple bead necklace, facing R. Now largely destroyed; complete on squeeze. Burton, T 849. Loret's plan, III, S. end of W. wall.
- R. Royal head with helmet, facing R. Lacunae on squeeze not seen in Burton's photo (T 824); other breaks shown in photo do not exist on squeeze. L., D., III, 77c. [11] on plan, Porter & Moss.
- S. Head and chest of man holding *hrrp*, facing L. Breaks on face in squeeze since restored; *hrrp* and hand grasping it now lost. Burton, T 844. Loret's plan, II, E. half of N. wall.
- T. Men bearing furniture, facing R (contiguous to G). Complete on squeeze; now very fragmentary. Burton, T 839. Loret's plan, II, E. half of S. wall. Plate I c.
- U. Men plowing, facing L. Complete on squeeze; now partly destroyed. [Book of Dead?]. Burton, T 844. Loret's plan, II, N. wall (centre?). Plate II d.


² The evidence of H and M indicates that the squeezes were made prior to 1884, the date of Loret's report. In both these impressions details are preserved which are missing in his publication.



a. Boston 86.213 V.



b. Boston 86.213 E.




c. Boston 86.213 T.



d. Boston 86.213 G.



a. Boston 86. 213 M.



b. Boston 86. 213 AA.



c. Boston 86. 213 BB.



d. Boston 86. 213 U.

- V. Three cattle in leash, facing R (adjacent to B and contiguous to DD).
Now lost; fits on at right of top register in *Atlas* I, Pl. 206. Blank in Burton, T 819. [10] on plan, Porter & Moss. Plate I a.
- W. Arm of throne, facing L. Smaller break than shown in Burton's photo (T 824); a few minor details can be restored from the squeeze. L., D., III, 77c [11] on plan, Porter & Moss.
- X. Kneeling man presenting leg of meat, facing R. No change. *Atlas* I, Pl. 210. Burton, T 840. Loret's plan, II, W. half of S. wall.
- Y. Four men with scribe's implements, facing L. No change. *Atlas* I, Pl. 189. Burton, T 831. Loret's plan, I, E. wall N. of doorway A.
- Z. Detail from offering scene; dead birds and inscription. No change. *Atlas* I, Pl. 189. Burton, T 832. Loret's plan, I, E. wall N. of doorway A.
- AA. Osiris and Isis facing L, part of a Nephthys facing R (adjacent to squeeze E). See remarks on E above. Loret's plan, I. 1 (over doorway to II). Plate II b.
- BB. Men offering before three seated gods of the Ennead. Loret's plan, II, q according to Brunton's report. Plate II c.
- CC. Part of 7 columns text (contiguous to O). No change. Loret, inscription o, lines 3-9.
- DD. One column text in relief (Contiguous to V). Now lost. Reads: . . . *šm'w mḥw š3' m t3 pn kš*. . . . " . . . Upper and Lower Egypt from this land of Kush . . . [to]." Contiguous to V on right, in front of heads of cattle.

TWO NOTES ON THE FLYING GALLOP¹

By WILLIAM F. EDGERTON

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

I

THE POSTURE illustrated by the horse in Fig. 1 is known in the history of art as the "flying gallop." Nineteenth century painters and draftsmen in Europe and America very often represented galloping horses in this posture; such pictures are doubtless familiar to all readers of this journal.

I believe it to be a fact that no horse ever approaches this posture while galloping over a level surface; the real posture occupied by a galloping horse when all four feet are in the air may be typified by Fig. 2. This fact was demonstrated by instantaneous photography during the 1870's. The illusion of the flying gallop had become so firmly fixed in the public mind by that time that some experienced observers are said to have doubted the accuracy of the photographs.

In 1900 and 1901 Salamon Reinach traced the history of the flying gallop as an artistic concept in ancient, medieval, and modern times in a series of brilliant and profoundly learned articles² which appear to have colored all subsequent discussions of the subject. Reinach's long and elaborately documented thesis has been well summed up by Berthold Laufer: "According to the ingenious investigations of this French archaeologist, this conventional motive appears neither in Assyria nor in Egypt, neither in the classical art of Greece nor in that of Etruria or Rome, nor in European art of the middle ages, the Renaissance, and the present age up to the time of the French Revolution (p. 11), when, in 1794, it appears for the first time in a popular engraving in England (p. 118). More than a millennium anterior to our era, how-

¹ The substance of this paper was briefly presented before the Middle West Branch of the American Oriental Society at the Presbyterian Theological Seminary in Chicago, March 27, 1936.

² *Revue archéologique*, 3me série, 36 (1900). 216-251 and 441-450; 37 (1900). 244-259; 38 (1901). 27-45 and 224-244; 39 (1901). 1-11; also separate, 1901(?) and 2nd ed. 1925. Only the original articles in the *Revue archéologique* have been accessible to me.

ever, it appears in the domain of Mycenæan art, then in Scythian and Siberian art, in the Caucasus, in the Persia of the Sassanidæ, and in China and Japan. The latter two countries present an uninterrupted repetition of this motive up to the present day. From Mycenæan art it migrated, through still little-known intermediary agencies, into the territory of the Scythians in the north and northeast of the Black Sea, and spread farther to Siberia, and from there to China towards 120 B. C., to Persia towards A. D. 220. Neither the art of the Achæmenidæ nor that of the Arsacidæ, which are ramifications of classical Greek art combined with Assyrian imitations (p. 78), furnishes one example of the flying gallop; while that of the Sassanidæ (since A. D. 226) shows a great number (p. 60) which must be traced back to the models of Siberian metal plaques. This theory of the migration of the flying-gallop motive is based first on the supposition that it does not correspond to any real movement of the actual gallop,³ as proved by the kinemato-photographic reproductions of the horse-gallop, in which that motive adopted by art does not occur, and can therefore have been fixed only once; and, secondly, on the undeniable historical fact that cultural relations and connections existed between the areas of Mycenæ, Scythia, the Caucasus, Siberia, Persia, and China."⁴

Some details in Reinach's position—for instance, the statement that the flying gallop never appears in Egypt—would probably not be maintained by anyone today. But his main thesis, that the flying gallop has been invented once and only once in all history, namely in the Mycenæan or Minoan world, early in the second millennium B. C., and that it spread thence by some more or less obscure route to China and Japan and later from the Far East to England and France—seems to have become almost a dogma among those who write on the subject.⁵

³ "Le motif du galop volant ne peut avoir été imaginé qu'une fois, parce qu'il ne répond pas à la réalité et n'est qu'un symbole."—Reinach, *La représentation du galop*, p. 83.

⁴ *Chinese Pottery of the Han Dynasty* (Leiden, 1909), pp. 221-22. The page numbers which Laufer gives in parentheses must refer to the 1901 (?) separate edition.

⁵ E. g., Evans, *Palace of Minos I* (1921), p. 713 ff.; Procopé-Walter, *Syria 10* (1929). 85 ff.; Rostovtzeff, *Dura and the Problem of Parthian art* (*Yale Classical Studies V*, 1935), p. 288 ff. I am indebted to Dr. Neilson C. Debevoise for showing me this latest work by Rostovtzeff.

This thesis rests, and must rest, in part on the belief that the flying gallop does not occur in nature. If the flying gallop does occur in nature, then it is certainly possible that any individual artist may have observed it independently, and the occurrence of the flying gallop in the artistic productions of any two peoples does not, in itself, constitute evidence of historical connection, even though other phenomena found in association with it may constitute such evidence.

Now Reinach correctly pointed out that the galloping horse does closely approach the attitude of the flying gallop in clearing an obstacle.⁶ I do not think that he gave due weight to this fact, and I have not found any mention of it at all in the writings of his successors. The clearing of a natural or artificial obstacle is often a crucial moment in a course, whether of the race-track, the hunt, or the battle-field. As such, it may easily make a more vivid impression on an observer than the more commonplace galloping over level ground.

A further fact, which seems to have been completely ignored by Reinach and all subsequent writers, is that animals of different species gallop differently. The examples of the flying gallop in art which have been cited as illustrating the dissemination of this "conventional" pose include representations of horses, dogs, cows, lions, pigs, goats, and several other species. Of all these species, the horse alone seems to have been adequately investigated. Yet the very work which gave Reinach his fundamental information about horses (Muybridge, *Animal locomotion*, Philadelphia, 1887) contains enough further evidence to upset the whole structure on which so many scholars have labored so long and so carefully. Plate 709 in volume 10 of Muybridge's great work (reproduced here in Fig. 3), proves beyond question that dogs—or at least some dogs—do use the flying gallop in traversing a level surface.⁷ I

⁶ *Revue archéol.* 36 (jan.-juin., 1900). 221-22.

⁷ A certain M. Marey, of the Académie des Sciences, wrote in a letter to Reinach Dec. 23, 1899: "Sur le chien au galop, on croit apercevoir cette attitude (*viz.*, the flying gallop) avec les quatre membres allongés; la chronophotographie montre qu'il y a toujours un membre à l'appui dans ces attitudes allongées" (*Revue arch.* 36, 219 n. 1). It is unfortunate that Reinach trusted M. Marey's statement about photographs of dogs instead of continuing his search in Muybridge's actual photographs.—I think it probable that there may be differences in the manner of galloping,

am not prepared to prove that other animals do likewise, though I am strongly inclined to believe that some others do. I am content to rest my case here on the dog, leaving the further study of other species to those who may have better photographic resources at their disposal. The example of the dog (Fig. 3) alone proves that the flying gallop is not an imaginary posture but a real one. It is only when applied to *horses* galloping over unobstructed ground that the pose has been shown to be imaginary, and even here the imaginary element consists merely in transferring to the horse in this situation a posture which we have all observed in other animals in this situation, and which is closely approximated by horses in other situations. The flying gallop as an artistic concept originated in the direct and accurate observation of nature. It is obvious, therefore, that it may have originated independently in the minds of any number of different artists, living in any number of different ages and countries, and the current belief that it can only have originated once, in a single age and country whence it must have spread to all other places where it may be found, is an error.

Like any other concept, that of the flying gallop is also capable of being transmitted from one individual to another and from one society to another. When it is shown on other grounds that one society has borrowed much from another, then, if the artistic concept of the flying gallop is common to both, it may well be that this also has been borrowed. It is not within my competence to discuss the question whether any cultural relations can be traced from Minoan Crete to Han Dynasty China. Frankly, I doubt whether anyone would ever have suggested such a connection if Reinach had turned from Muybridge's photographs of galloping horses to Muybridge's photographs of galloping dogs before writing his series of articles. Be this as it may, those within whose competence the problem lies must eliminate the flying gallop from their lists of evidence. Pictures showing the flying gallop may well happen to contain, also, artistic conventions such as cannot well have been invented more than once in the world's history. It may even be found, after further cinematographic study, that there are some specific ways of representing the flying gallop in art

even among different varieties of one species. Contrast the dog of Muybridge's plate 707 with that of his plate 709.

which deviate so far from anything observable in real life as to fall within that category. What is certain is that the flying gallop itself is not a convention, but a reality of the world of flesh and blood, and the mere fact of its being represented in art does not in itself prove the transmission of culture.

II

I think it has been shown in the first section of this article that the presence of the flying gallop in the artistic productions of two peoples, does not, in itself, constitute evidence of direct or even indirect historic contact between the two.

It is certain that Egypt and Crete were in direct contact with one another, either continuously or at frequent intervals, from before the time of Menes until the decline of the late Minoan civilization. Cretan culture shows deep and abiding Egyptian influence,⁸ and I am of those who would expect, a priori, to find signs of Cretan influence in Egyptian culture. Certain scholars⁹ have held that the methods used by Egyptian artists of the eighteenth dynasty and later to show animals in violent motion, are traceable to Cretan influence. It seems to me that the evidence presented in part I places this problem in a new light and I therefore propose to review the relevant Egyptian documents.

The overwhelming majority of Egyptian pictures of quadrupeds represent them walking, or as if they were walking. In most cases the animals are actually conceived as walking; so, for instance the three yoke of plowing cows in the upper register of Fig. 4 and the rams treading in the seed in the lower register. In some other cases, not illustrated here, animals so drawn are thought of as standing: in those cases, the leg posture may perhaps be borrowed from the much commoner pictures of walking animals. But perhaps a more important reason for the posture may be the desire to show all four legs clearly, without allowing the nearer legs to obscure the farther ones. Compare the common Egyptian representation of horns, also illustrated here. Whatever the reason, this may be called the typical Egyptian posture for represent-

⁸ See Evans, *The Palace of Minos* I, pp. 16-19, *et passim*.

⁹ E. g., Evans, *op. cit.*, p. 713 ff.; Schäfer, *Von äg. Kunst*³, pp. 18-19. Contrast Spiegelberg in *Münchener Jahrbuch der bildenden Kunst*, N. F. 3 (1926), 126-128, a reference which I owe to Professor Ludwig Bachhofer.

ing a quadruped in drawing or in low relief. It is the posture which the typical Egyptian draftsman of all periods will use when he wishes merely to represent a certain type of quadruped without any further qualification. Any deviation from this posture, generally speaking, will have some special explanation. For example, the cow at the right of Fig. 4 deviates from the typical posture because she is being milked. The figure of the milker would interfere somewhat with the normal position of the cow's legs and in addition the two hind legs of the cow have been tied together.

It is chiefly in hunting scenes that Egyptian artists had occasion to represent the gallop. The earliest hunting scene known to me in dynastic Egyptian art is that from the tomb of Methen, now in Berlin (Fig. 5).¹⁰ Each animal in the upper registers has all four feet firmly planted on the ground. These animals, taken by themselves, might easily be conceived as standing motionless, perhaps frightened and ready to run, but not yet running, or perhaps standing *obstinately* and refusing to budge. If I venture to assert that these animals are galloping at full speed over the desert,¹¹ I base this view on the dogs which show that a hunting scene is intended—and on comparison with later, and more developed, hunting scenes, such as that from the mortuary temple of Sahure at Abusir (Fig. 6).

Two of the hunted animals in Fig. 6 stand with upraised fore feet and one with upraised hind feet. One of these is certainly not running, but stands rearing in pain while vainly attempting to extract an arrow which has wounded it.¹² The two others might be interpreted as running. But it is at least equally possible that they too are conceived as rearing and plunging with pain and no longer attempting to run.



Notice that the few unwounded animals, as far as preserved, stand invariably with all four feet on the ground, though the whole context compels us to think of them as running. On this

¹⁰ The scene from the tomb of Nefermaat (Wreszinski, *Atlas* I. 396) is approximately contemporary with this.

¹¹ I believe this to be the current interpretation. So, for instance, Schäfer, *Propyläen-Kunstgeschichte* II (1925). 43, "gallopiierende Tierfiguren."

¹² The reader will recognize this animal again in Fig. 11, bottom, center. A further variation of the same motif occurs in the tomb of Ineni (Eighteenth dynasty: Wreszinski, *Atlas* I, pl. 262).

interpretation the posture must be absolutely unnatural. Surely, no animal on earth gallops or runs like this. But the Egyptian artist at all periods has a wholly unnaturalistic tendency to keep the feet of animals and of men on the ground. Running men are habitually shown with both feet touching the ground (Fig. 7). Similarly, galloping animals are habitually shown with all four feet on the ground—and not merely touching, but resting solidly on it.

Now if it is true, as I believe, that these hunted animals were conceived by Old Kingdom artists and their public as running, then their conventional posture—the two fore feet together and the two hind feet together, in sharp contrast to the conventional posture of standing or walking animals—must be an expression of that fact. How did this posture acquire this meaning? Presumably because it resembled some posture which some artist, at some time, had actually observed in galloping animals. The animals in question cannot have been horses, since no Egyptian had ever seen a horse up to this time. The limitations of the photographic materials which have been available to me compel me to state my views at this point with a great deal of reserve. It may be that some species which was common in ancient Egypt but which is not adequately represented in my photographic sources, would present a better solution of the problem.¹³ Limiting myself, as I must, to the photographs which have actually been accessible, I find one real posture, and only one, from which the artistic type  with the meaning "running animal" appears to me to be derivable: that real posture is the flying gallop, as illustrated by the dog in Fig. 3. I therefore venture to set up the hypothesis that the type  in Old Kingdom hunting scenes may be, at least in some cases, a rudimentary representation of the flying gallop. If we find that Egyptian artists in later centuries extend the legs of their galloping animals farther forward or backward, or lift the feet off the ground, such changes may be attributed either to greater accuracy in observing, or to a stronger desire for accuracy in portraying.

¹³ Muybridge's photographs of deer, antelopes etc. are very unsatisfactory, doubtless because he could not control their movements as he could those of horses and dogs. The subject requires investigation with modern cinematographic apparatus.

In a relief from the sun-temple of Nuserre at Abusir,¹⁴ perhaps 50 years later than Fig. 6, we have desert animals which are not being hunted and therefore are not galloping; most of them are drawn as if walking, one may be either kicking sand over his head¹⁵ or perhaps caught in a snare (?), two are calving, while a single one (the second from the left in the upper register) may perhaps be galloping.

Figs. 8, 9, and 10 show that it was not at all unthinkable for an Egyptian artist of the Old Kingdom to draw an animal with one or more feet lifted off the ground, provided the animal was not running.

Not until the Middle Kingdom do we meet a perfectly unambiguous example of a running animal with two feet off the ground. The earliest specimen known to me is in the tomb of Ukhhotep's son Senbi (B, No. 1) at Meir (Fig. 11). Here the leg-joints, in general, are a shade less stiff than in Sahure's hunting scene, and the angle of spread between fore and hind legs of those animals which "gallop" with all four feet on the ground is a shade greater though both of these differences are so slight that they can easily be overlooked. A more noteworthy innovation is the hare at the bottom left, which is shown just coming down on the fore feet,¹⁶ as from a flying gallop: this is the earliest example known to me from Egyptian art of an unwounded running animal with any foot off the ground. The two antelopes at the bottom right are perhaps also running—but they may be rearing in pain, the single arrow having perhaps transfixed them both in accordance with the well-known Egyptian habit of exaggeration. I abstain from discussing the antelopes in the top center in view of their unsatisfactory preservation. In terms of Cretan chronology this picture is certainly not later than M. M. II and is more probably contemporary with M. M. I.¹⁷

¹⁴ Eduard Meyer, *Aegypten zur Zeit der Pyramidenbauer*, pl. 10, bottom.

¹⁵ Meyer, *op. cit.*, p. 31.

¹⁶ That the hare comes down on *both* fore feet together, is a detail which I can neither confirm nor refute from the photographs at my disposal. The horse sometimes does so after clearing a hurdle, ex. Muybridge, vol. 9, plate 641.

¹⁷ Blackman dated this tomb to the reign of Amenemhet I, and I do not know that anyone has questioned the date, though I should not myself venture to exclude a date as early as the eleventh dynasty or as late as

A picture which can be dated with greater precision is Fig. 13, from the Theban tomb of Antefoker, vizir of Sesostris I, in the middle of the twentieth century B. C. Here no running animal lifts a foot off the ground. But the spread between fore legs and hind legs is much greater than in the fifth dynasty hunting scene of Sahure, a much nearer approach to the flying gallop as illustrated in our modern photograph of a galloping dog.

With Fig. 14 we pass from the reign of Sesostris I to that of Amenhotep II: from the twentieth century B. C. to the second half of the fifteenth century. During this interval, the horse and the wheeled vehicle were introduced into Egypt from southwestern Asia. Whether this apparently unreal manner of depicting the horse in Egyptian art was also imported from Asia, is a question which I expressly abstain from discussing. In order to answer that question, we should need, for one thing, a more precise dating of the corresponding Asiatic horse-pictures than seems possible at present; therefore I prefer to leave the question open.

Turning now to the desert animals in Fig. 14, the animals which belonged to the old Egyptian tradition, we find a number of striking changes in the manner in which these are drawn.

First, the head and neck are drawn upward and backward in a manner which I cannot parallel from older Egyptian pictures. So far as I can judge, this change is probably away from naturalism. But it may well be borrowed from the horse-pictures, where it was suggested by the actual reining-in of the horse's head.

Second, the legs are extended much more vigorously forward and backward, though not so far as in some Cretan pictures. This is a strongly accentuated continuation of a process which was already faintly discernable in twelfth dynasty pictures as compared to those of the fifth dynasty. Furthermore, the soles of the hind feet in some cases are turned upward, and the animal's back in some cases is strongly concave (compare the dog in Fig. 3). These

Sesostris III. There seems to be no positive reason to seek a later date than Amenemhet I—unless we choose to treat the animal postures as such a reason, thereby begging the question which we have to discuss. Evans, *The Palace of Minos* I, p. 714 and Schäfer, *Von äg. Kunst*², p. 18, would seem to have overlooked this picture, or at all events the hare in it. Spiegelberg evidently saw its importance (see footnote 9 above) though in the published summary of his lecture the reference is not specific.

changes are probably in the direction of objective reality, and therefore no foreign influence is needed to explain them.

Finally, there is a greatly increased tendency to omit the ground line. Old and Middle Kingdom artists occasionally omitted the ground line, as in the picture of four goats eating the leaves of a tree (Fig. 9), but such cases are exceptional before the eighteenth dynasty. In our picture, three ground lines are shown, but at least three more have to be imagined. This omission greatly strengthens the impression that the animals are flying through the air. If we drew in the imagined ground lines, we should probably find that every animal rested with one or two feet on the ground and some perhaps with all four feet.

Rather different is the case of Fig. 12 (first half of the fifteenth century, a generation earlier than Fig. 14). Most of this picture, too, is thoroughly Egyptian. The two deer standing quietly at the extreme right of the second register might almost have been drawn by an artist of the fifth dynasty. The galloping hares immediately below them seem to me a natural Egyptian development in the direction of greater objectivity, like the galloping animals in Fig. 14. But the oryx in flying gallop at the left of the top register, whose feet are lifted so high that a line joining them would cut through the middle or upper part of his trunk, and the dog in the middle of the same register who doubles backward at the instant when his fore feet touch the ground,¹⁸ are not explicable in terms of any photograph which I have seen. They could be explained as borrowings from Minoan art, if such an explanation were needed. Yet I should like to await further evidence. I should like to see photographs corresponding to the words of Sir Harry Johnston, which Davies quotes à propos of this picture: "Reedbuck bend their lissom bodies into such a bounding gallop that the spine seems to become concave as the animal's rear is flung high into the air."¹⁹

Doubtless Cretan works of art were accessible to Egyptian artists of this period. An example which bears directly on our problem is the celebrated dagger-blade from the burial of Queen Aahhotep (Fig. 15). Here a galloping bull and lion whose bellies come down practically as low as their feet are drawn in association

¹⁸ The ground line is not represented.

¹⁹ Johnston, *The Uganda Protectorate I* (1902), p. 26.

with other details of Cretan origin. As Evans has justly remarked, "The details as well as the spirit of the design are indeed so purely Minoan that it is difficult not to conclude that this part of the engraving, and with it probably the grasshoppers beyond, was the work of a Minoan craftsman."²⁰ To my mind, even the hieroglyphs have an un-Egyptian air, and I am inclined to believe that the blade in its entirety is of Minoan workmanship.²¹ We cannot know how widely distributed such Cretan models may have been in eighteenth dynasty Egypt. But the hunting scene of Senbi (Fig. 11) shows that Egyptian artists, under the influence of a native tendency toward realism, had already moved an appreciable distance toward the types of Figs. 12 and 14 at a period contemporary with Middle Minoan I or II—a period, therefore, at least as early as the oldest Minoan representations of the flying gallop which are now known.

CONCLUSIONS

I. The flying gallop is not an imaginary but a real posture. It does not, in itself, belong to that group of purely conventional artistic concepts whose unreality makes them usable as evidence for the transmission of culture.

II. It would be rash, at present, to assert categorically that Minoan influence is totally absent in all eighteenth dynasty pictures of galloping animals. A great deal of systematic work with modern cinema cameras will have to precede any final conclusion on this point. But it has not yet been proved that any of the new types (horses excepted) which distinguish the eighteenth dynasty animal pictures from those of the twelfth dynasty are essentially unreal. Until such proof is forthcoming we have no reason to postulate foreign influence, even for those types which may happen to occur earlier elsewhere than in Egypt.

²⁰ Evans, *Palace of Minos* I, p. 715, where a clearer reproduction of the animals will also be found. See also *id.*, *op. cit.* IV, p. 527.

²¹ It is of course quite possible that the Minoan craftsman may have lived and worked in Egypt. Cf. Evans, *op. cit.* I, p. 18.



FIG. 1: Reinach's type of the flying gallop as an artistic convention.

Source: *Revue archéologique* 36 (1900).
p. 218.



FIG. 2: Reinach's type of the real gallop as contrasted with the "unreal" flying gallop.
From the same source as Fig. 1.




FIG. 3: Nineteenth century photographs of a galloping dog in twelve successive postures.
Compare the ninth posture with Reinach's type of the flying gallop (Fig. 1).

Source: Muybridge, *Animal Locomotion*, vol. 10, pl. 709.




FIG. 4: Scene illustrating the typical Egyptian way of depicting quadrupeds.

Source: Steindorff, *Das Grab des Ti*, pl. 111.




FIG. 5: Hunting scene. Beginning of fourth dynasty.
Source: Lepsius, *Denkmäler*, II, pl. 6.




FIG. 7: Running men. Fifth dynasty.
Source: Borchardt, *op. cit.*, pl. 10.




FIG. 8: Tethered calves. Fifth dynasty.
Source: Davies, *The Mastaba of Ptahhetep*, II, pl. 11.




FIG. 6: Hunting scene. Fifty dynasty.
Source: Borchardt, *Das Grabdenkmal des Königs S'aḫu-re'*, II, pl. 17.




FIG. 9: Goats eating foliage. A subsidiary ground line is to be thought of under each of the "upper" goats. Sixth dynasty.
Source: Lepsius, *Denkmäler*, II, pl. 111 b.



FIG. 10: Two animals dancing(?) to the tune of a flute. Sixth dynasty.
Source: Blackman, *The Rock Tombs of Meir*, IV, pl. 14.




FIG. 11: Hunting scene. Twelfth dynasty.
Source: Blackman, *op. cit.*, I, pl. 6.



FIG. 12: Hunting scene. Eighteenth dynasty. (Hatshepsut-Thutmose III).
Source: Davies, *The Tomb of Puyemrê*, I, pl. 7.




FIG. 13: Hunting scene. Twelfth dynasty. (Sesostri I).
Source: Davies, *The Tomb of Antefoker*, pl. 6.



FIG. 14: Hunting scene. Eighteenth dynasty. (Amenhotep II).
Source: Wreszinski, *Atlas*, I, pl. 26 (a).




FIG. 15: Dagger bearing the name of King Ahmose I, found in the burial of Queen Aahhotep.

Source: Bissing, *Ein thebanischer Grabfund*, pl. 2.

THE EGYPTIAN ORIGIN OF SOME ENGLISH PERSONAL NAMES

ALAN H. GARDINER

LONDON, ENGLAND

CONTRIBUTORS to the present volume may well have reflected upon the very unusual quality of mind which enabled James Henry Breasted to conceive and inspire what he described as a "research laboratory" for the enrichment of modern knowledge "with a fuller vision of the rise of man." The Oriental Institute is the monument to a scholar who was a human being first of all—to one who, while living ardently in the present, kept his gaze unceasingly fixed upon the past from which that present has sprung. To him, in fact, past and present were indivisible, and being imbued as he was with an intense interest in all evolution, no question of origins could be indifferent to him. This article can deal only with a small and unimportant aspect of human affairs, but, such as it is, I derive satisfaction from the thought that the topic would not have been uncongenial to my deeply regretted friend.

The conclusions to be reached are unhappily mostly negative or at least highly speculative, but we are fortunate in being able to point to one common English Christian name the Egyptian origin of which is beyond question. That name is Susan, and it goes back, of course, to the pious and beautiful wife of Joakim whose story is told in an apocryphal addition to the book of Daniel. The Greek form of the name is *Σουσάνα*, and the corresponding Hebrew is *שושנה*, an obvious derivative of the fairly common word *שושן* "a lily." The Egyptian origin of the latter was pointed out long ago, whether first of all by Brugsch or some other I will not inquire. The Egyptian word for a "lotus" was *zššn*, later *zšn*.¹ This in Coptic has become *šōšen*, with the same assimilation of the first two radicals as that found in Coptic *šoušet* "window," from old *ššd*. Erman (*ZDMG* 46 [1892] 117), in accepting the view that the Hebrew *šūšan* and its Arabic equivalent *sūsān* are loan-

¹If anyone should doubt the Hebrew and Egyptian equivalence, his scruples should surely be overcome by the facts that Hebrew *šūšan* is used in I Kings 7: 19 of flower-shaped capitals of pillars, and ib. 7: 26 of a vase of some sort. The archaeological analogies admit of no hesitation.

words from the Egyptian, rightly observes that the borrowing must have been one of comparatively late date, for even in Ramesside times there is no trace of the assimilation. The use of *šūšan* in a feminine form as a proper name will have taken place within Hebrew itself, where other plant-names as well are used for both men and women.² In Egyptian *zšn* "lotus" is indeed used as a personal name, but only for men.³

Thus encouraged by Susan, we shall be the better able to face the disappointment occasioned by Humphrey. It was with surprise and delight that about a twelvemonth ago I learned from Baedeker's guide to Rome and Central Italy (16th English edition, p. 456) that the church of Sant' Onofrio in the Via del Gianicolo owes its name to an Egyptian hermit bearing the name "Onuphrius or Humphrey." Of him Evetts writes:⁴ "This saint, called in Arabic Abū Nafar, whose festival is kept on Ba'ūnah 16 = June 10, and by the Roman church on June 12, was a hermit in Upper Egypt. His life was written by St. Paphnutius, of whom Onuphrius was an elder contemporary. . . . Onuphrius would seem to have died about A. D. 400." The story of St. Onuphrius is preserved in a Sahidic manuscript written about six hundred years later.⁵ It is not he, however, but his name, in Coptic *ouenōbr*, *ouanōfre*, etc., which interests us. This was quite a common personal name in Egypt alike in Coptic,⁶ in Greek,⁷ and in Pharaonic⁸ times, and originated in the well-known epithet of Osiris which means "He-who-is-continually-good"; the hieroglyphs give *Wnn-nfr*, and this combination of imperfective active participle of the verb "to be" with the old perfective **nōfru* was doubtless meant to stress the permanent, unvarying character of the god.⁹ But is this

² See *Encyclopædia Biblica*, s. v. Names § 69.

³ See Ranke, *Die ägyptischen Personennamen* (henceforth quoted as Ranke), 297. 29-31; 298. 2.

⁴ B. T. A. Evetts, *The Churches and Monasteries of Egypt*, p. 111 n. 2.

⁵ Budge, *Coptic Martyrdoms etc. in the Dialect of Upper Egypt*, pp. 205 ff., 455 ff.

⁶ See Crum, *Ostraca*; Crum and Steindorff, *Koptische Rechtsurkunden*, etc. Heuser (*Personennamen der Kopten*, I 59) quotes other Egyptian divine epithets that gave rise to Coptic personal names.

⁷ Preisigke, *Namenbuch* 242, 247. The best spelling is *Ονωφρις*, but there are many variants, e. g., *Ονωφρις*, *Οροφρι*, *Ουεραφρις*.

⁸ Ranke 79. 19.

⁹ Hence the common rendering "The good being" is wrong.

Humphrey? Pleasant as it would have been to announce to the distinguished head of the Oxford University Press that his name owes its ancestry to the greatest of Egyptian deities, I must deny myself that treat. At first, it must be admitted, the glamour of the derivation itself and the authority of Baedeker combined to beguile me, but further inquiry has shown that the identification is untenable. To begin with, is it likely that an obscure Coptic anchorite should have conferred his name upon a royal duke, a celebrated navigator, and the hero of a novel by Smollett? More serious, however, is the fact that another derivation of Humfrey—for that is the less barbarous spelling of the name—has far better claims to acceptance. In form Humfrey recalls Godfrey, and the parallelism is continued in other languages, for in French we have Onfroi and Godefroi, in German Humfrid (Hunifred) and Gottfried. The Teutonic origin is thus clear, and there can be no doubt that the first element is the word *hun* which means a "support," while the second element is the word for "peace," found also in Siegfried and Wilfred. Thus the entire name means something like "support-of-peace." In excuse of Baedeker I will quote some lines from Miss Charlotte M. Yonge's still unsurpassed *History of Christian Names* (1884. 350), whence it will be seen that the confusion of Humfrey and Onofrio was the deed of some medieval chronicler: "(The name) Hunifred, which the French much affected in the form of Onfroi, belonged to one of the short-lived kings of Jerusalem, and was latinized as Onuphrius." Miss Yonge's account of the name's subsequent history is not without interest: "In the form of Humfrey it was much used by the great house of Bohun; and through his mother, their heiress, descended to the ill-fated son of Henry IV, who has left it an open question whether dining with Duke Humfrey alludes to the report that he was starved to death, or to the Elizabethan habit for our gentility to beguile their dinner hour by a promenade near his tomb at old St. Paul's."

There is much more to be said in favour of an Egyptian origin of Moses and Phineas, but here the question presents itself as to how far these names are entitled to be described as English. We will assume them to be such; Phineas, at least, was common in Puritan days and is still not rare in America. Phineas comes, of course, from the Biblical name Phinehas best known as the name of a son of Eli, the priest of Shiloh, though there is another

Phinehas, the son of Eleazar, mentioned Ex. 6:25; Num. 25:7 and elsewhere. The very look of the Hebrew פִּינְחָס *Pi-nehās* suggests Ancient Egypt,¹⁰ and it would demand an excessive scepticism to reject the long-accepted derivation from *P'-Nhsy* "the Nubian." This Egyptian name was common from the end of the Eighteenth Dynasty onwards,¹¹ but has not survived into Coptic, where it is replaced by *Pegōsh* "the Cushite." In dynastic times there were at least three highly distinguished personages of the name, first the Chief Treasurer whom Amenophis III sent to Sinai,¹² second the Vizier who lived under Menephtah,¹³ and lastly the Royal Son of Cush contemporary with Ramesses XI.¹⁴

The majority of scholars—I will mention only Ed. Meyer, Kittel, Gressmann among the Germans, Driver, Griffith, Burney and Robinson among ourselves—have settled down to the comfortable belief that Moses is really an Egyptian name, a shortening of one of those theophorous names like 'Aḥmōse, Ptahmōse, Thutmōse, which were very common throughout the New Kingdom. It may be so, and yet there is considerable force in the objections to this view that have been raised. For the moment let us assume it to be the true view. The Egyptian names just quoted mean respectively "Yoh (the Moon), Ptah, or Thoth is born" and refer, according to Ranke,¹⁵ to the birthdays of the gods in question. For non-Egyptologists it is necessary to point out that Ramesses (*R'-ms-sw*), though containing the same verbal stem, is a name of a wholly different type, containing not the old perfective *-mōse*, older *-māse*, "is born," but the active participle *-mās* "having borne" followed by the pronoun *se* "him"; thus Ramesses means "Rē (the Sun-god)-is-he-that-hath-borne-him."¹⁶ The shortening of 'Aḥmōse, Amenmōse and the rest into simple Mōse (written in hieroglyphs *Ms* or *Msw*)¹⁷ is common and well attested within Egyptian itself.

¹⁰ The Septuagint has *Φεινῆς* and the Coptic version *Penhēs*. The *godh* after the initial consonant is abnormal, but offers no serious objection.

¹¹ Ranke 113. 13.

¹² Gardiner and Peet, *Inscriptions of Sinai*, I, nos. 211, 219, 220, 221.

¹³ A. Weil, *Veziere*, p. 104 § 26.

¹⁴ *JEA* 6. 51.

¹⁵ Griffith (*apud* Burney, *Israel's Settlement in Canaan* 47 n. 2) accepts the rendering "is born," but supposes (if rightly reported) that *-ms* is a passive participle, whereas surely it is the old perfective, in Coptic *-mōse*. For the Greek equivalents like *Αμωσις* with long *ō* see Sethe, "Die Vokalisation des ägyptischen," in *ZDMG* 77 (1923), 168-9.

¹⁶ Sethe, *op. cit.*, 190.

¹⁷ Ranke 164. 18; 165. 11.

In two passages a mysterious *Msw*, *Msy*, is mentioned in such a way as to preclude reference to anyone of much lower rank than the reigning king, and in both cases Egyptologists have not been wanting who would proclaim the presence of Moses himself.¹⁸ The first passage is in the ironical composition contained in the Papyrus Anastasi I (18.2). The scribe, whose incompetence is so scathingly criticized, has failed to make proper provision for a military expedition, and the soldiers are represented as saying "*What means it that there is no bread at all? Our night quarters are far off! What means, good sir, this scourging of us? . . . This is not good; let Möse hear of it, and he will send to destroy thee!*" The second passage differs in that it is drawn, not from a literary text, but from an actual record of accusations brought against a well-known chief workman in the Theban Necropolis. Here the passage runs: "*The chief workman Neferhotep brought a plaint against him (i. e., the defendant Penēb): before the Vizier Amenmöse, and he inflicted punishment upon him. And he (i. e., Penēb) brought a plaint against the Vizier before Möse, and had him dismissed from the office of Vizier, saying: He has chastised me.*"¹⁹ The common-sense view of Möse in these passages is that it is a nickname for the reigning Pharaoh,²⁰ though it can hardly be a shortening of Ramesses, since in the second case not a Ramesses, but either Siptah I or Amenmöse was upon the throne. The name Möse is thus for the present utterly inexplicable, but it must be left for those who have the courage—a better word would perhaps be temerity—to find here a reference to the Moses of the Bible.

Now though the name Möse as shortening of *Aḥmöse, Amenmöse, etc., is not identical with the element *-mas-* found in Ramesses (see above), yet the two come from the same verbal stem meaning "to bear, to give birth." Consequently, one might expect the name Moses, if really derived from the former, to present the

¹⁸ Lauth did so in connection with the first passage to be quoted below, and unless I am mistaken, a living Egyptologist of otherwise good judgment took the same course not many years ago in a newspaper letter or article on the basis of the second passage.

¹⁹ *Pap. Salt 124*, rt. 2. 17. Latest and best edition by Černý in *JEA* 15. 243 ff. Černý (p. 255) conjectures that *Msy* here is a nickname of the king Amenmöse. But this involves the separation of the Salt passage from that in *Anastasi I*, which is highly improbable.

²⁰ This view I have expressed on various occasions, and it is quoted with warm approval by Ranke, *ZÄS* 58. 135.

same sibilant in Hebrew as the Hebrew equivalent for Ramesses. Such, however, is not the fact; Ramesses, preserved in the name of the town of Ramses (רַעַסֶסֶס) Gen. 47:11; Ex. 1:11, shows a *sāmekh*, while Moses (מֹשֶׁה) shows a *shîn*. This is not the place to argue the various ways in which the difference of sibilant can be overcome, the more so since at the back of our minds the objection would still probably remain. The best argument in favour of the derivation of Mōsheh-Moses from the Egyptian Mōse is that there is no other derivation nearly as good. It would be useless to enumerate all the various conjectures here; the most recent additions are Yahuda's *mw* = "seed" and *š* = "lake" or "Nile,"²¹ and the Rev. J. R. Towers' *mi* or *ma Shu* "Like the Sun."²² If we prefer the derivation from Egyptian Mōse, let us at least be clear in our minds that we may well be influenced by the form in which the name Moses appears in our English translation of the Bible. And, on due reflection, would it not be more scientific to admit that we have no satisfactory evidence for choosing any derivation at all?

If, in the teeth of all objections, the Egyptian origin of Moses be upheld, then why not also that of Miriam and of Mary, the later equivalent of Miriam? In my opinion, at least as good a case can be made out for an Egyptian derivation of Miriam as has been made for Moses. Eduard Meyer is insistent that Egyptian names ran in the family of Moses, for he holds that the latter's son Eliezer (Ex. 18:4) was identical with the Eleazar, father of Phinehas (Jos. 24:33), whom Deut. 10:6 gives as a son of Aaron.²³ Eleazar's father-in-law פִּיטִיֶּאֱל Pūtiāl (Ex. 6:25) was likewise doubtless the bearer of an Egyptian name, apart from the element *Ēl*, which may have been chosen to replace some more heathenish divinity; at all events, the name presents exactly the same formation as that of the priest of On פִּיטִיפֶרֶע Potiphera, an excellent rendering of Egyptian *P'-di-p'-r* "He whom the Sun gives" (Heliodorus), which all sensible scholars admit.²⁴ There is thus

²¹ *Language of the Pentateuch* 260.

²² "The name Moses," in *Journ. Theol. Stud.* 36. 407.

²³ *Geschichte des Altertums*², II, 2, 208.

²⁴ Cf. Petēsis, Peteamounis, Petosiris. It is doubtless mere accident that Petēprē has not been found in hieroglyphic texts. For the formation and Hebrew writing see Sethe, *op. cit.*, 182, n. 2; Griffith, *Rylands Papyri*, iii, 192.

some *a priori* ground for supposing Miriam, the sister of Moses and Aaron, to have received her name from Egypt. This supposition would obviously fall to the ground if there were any really likely derivation for the name from Hebrew itself. In the wholly admirable monograph which Bardenhewer has devoted to the subject,²⁵ he arrives at the conclusion that the derivation from the stem מֵרָא "to be fat" is as likely as any; מֵרָא Miriam might be an adjective in -m from this stem, and the meaning "the plump" would not be out of keeping with Semitic ideals of feminine attractiveness. This theory, though far superior to all other rivals, is open to some weighty objections. If the name Miriam were, or had once been, a common epithet of the kind, how comes it that no other examples of it occur until just before the beginning of our era, when it suddenly springs into popularity in the form of Maria, Greek Μαρία? Furthermore, adjectival formations in -m, like עֲמְרָם 'Amrām, elsewhere are masculine, not feminine. At all events, the suggested derivation is not sufficiently convincing to prohibit us from seeking a solution of the problem in another direction. I have to admit, however, that if the final -m is essential (Μαρία suggests that it is not), then no Egyptian hypothesis can be plausibly presented. Bardenhewer castigates an impossible suggestion put forward by the venturesome Egyptologist Lauth. But it is strange that no one seems to have thought of a most striking Egyptian counterpart. No Egyptian personal names are commoner than what the hieroglyphs write as *Mry* for the masculine and as *Mryt* for the feminine,²⁶ meaning either "The-beloved" absolutely or "The-beloved" as shortening of some theophorous name like 'Imn-mryt (doubtless to be read *Mryt-'Imn*) "The-beloved-of-Amūn."²⁷ At some time or other *Mryt* was doubtless vocalized Marye, since we have in Coptic a well-authenticated perfect passive participle from another verb of the same class, namely *hasie*, originally meaning "favoured" or "blessed."²⁸ Unhappily, it

²⁵ *Biblische Studien*, vol. 1, pt. 1.

²⁶ Ranke 160. 1; 161. 14.

²⁷ Divine names were often written *honoris causa* in front of words which they followed in actual speech.

²⁸ Preserved in the Coptic *bōk-n-hasie* "to be drowned," literally "to depart as a favoured one," see Griffith, "Apotheosis by Drowning," in *ZAS* 46. 132. This *hasie* is of interest also for the etymology of Μωσής = Moses given by Josephus, contra Apionem II 9. 6 Τὸ γὰρ ἕδωρ μὴ οἷ Ἀλυπτικός· καλοῦσι, ὅσῃς δὲ τοῦς (ἐξ ἕδατος) σωθέντας. I am not sure if it has been pointed

seems likely that from the Nineteenth Dynasty onward, i. e., in the period within which the supposed borrowing of the name must have taken place, the *r* of Egyptian *Marye* had become assimilated to the following *y* or *i*, so that *Maye* or *Maya* was the full form; in the Boghazköi tablets "beloved of *Amūn*" is rendered by *Ma'i-Amana*, and the Greek equivalent *μαριον* is well known. Nevertheless there is one way in which the old pronunciation *Marye* can be saved for an etymology of *Mary*, *Mariam*, *Miriam*. It is noticeable that the Bible has very little to say about *Miriam's* personality. She is mentioned but three times in all, apart from the Levitical genealogies: once in a record of her death and burial (Num. 20:1), once when she rebels with her brother *Aaron* against the authority of *Moses* and is punished with leprosy (Num. 12:1-5), and once (Ex. 15:20-1) as the prophetess who, when *Moses* and the children of *Israel* sang their song of triumph over *Pharaoh* and his chariotry, "took a timbrel in her hand, and all the women went out after her with timbrels and with dances." "And *Miriam*," the text continues, "answered them:

Sing ye to the Lord, for he hath triumphed gloriously;
The horse and his rider hath he thrown into the sea."

Here and here only does *Miriam* betray any distinctive character of her own, and then it is as prophetess and as musician. It seems impossible not to think of the Egyptian goddesses and priestesses who were called *Mrt*, i. e., in all probability *Marye* "the-beloved," and who are not seldom depicted playing the harp or the sistrum on Egyptian temple walls.²⁹

It would be agreeable to think of the name *Mary* as originating in the Egyptian goddess of music, and I venture to think that the possibility should not be rejected out of hand. But the more carefully one studies the earliest Biblical and Egyptian connections,

out that *ἱερός* here is clearly a perversion of *αἷος*, the Greek equivalent of *hasie*, though there will have been some confusion in the writer's mind, since an Egyptian became 'favoured' (*αἷος*) by the fact of being drowned, not by being saved from drowning.

²⁹ The earliest mention is in the *Admonitions of an Egyptian Sage*, ed. Gardiner, p. 59. There were two such goddesses, one for Upper and one for Lower Egypt; and sometimes in temple ceremonies they appear to have been impersonated by actual women. To the references in the book cited above may be added Kees, *Der Opfertanz des ägyptischen Königs*, 103 ff.; Blackman in *JEA* VII, 8 ff.

the more hazardous do any decided convictions on the subject show themselves to be. I will therefore sum up the results of my investigation: Humphrey is clearly not of Egyptian origin, and Moses and Mary are extremely doubtful; on the other hand, Susan and Phineas can be confidently accepted as good Egyptian names.

Addendum

Since my article was sent in I have called to mind yet another name, or rather group of names, for which Egyptian descent has been implicitly claimed. Time fails me to investigate who first connected Latin *lilium* with the Coptic word for "flower," but Professor Lefert has recently quoted the derivation with approval and used it as the basis for an argument (admittedly of a very fragile kind) to the effect that the dialect of Coptic spoken on the Mediterranean coast of Egypt was that now known as Fayyûmic or Middle Egyptian (*Muséon* 44. 120. n. 2). For in Fayyûmic the old Egyptian *hrêre(t)* "flower" has assumed the form *hlêli*, whereas in Sahidic and Bohairic the old *r* has not changed to *l*. By way of corroboration M. Lefert advances a new etymology of his own, namely Latin *columba* from Coptic *groompe* (Fayy. **glampi*) with the same meaning. I do not feel qualified to express an opinion on these daring hypotheses, but it seemed necessary, for completeness sake, to add Lilly, Lilian, and Liliás to the English names which have become candidates for the same high honor as Phineas and Susan.

TRACES OF BIBLICAL INFLUENCE IN THE TURFAN PAHLAVI FRAGMENT M. 173

A. V. WILLIAMS JACKSON
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

STUDENTS of Manichaeism are familiar with the influence exercised upon Mānī by the Scriptures.¹ Saint Augustine, who was for nine years a Manichaean before his conversion to Christianity, bears abundant testimony to this by citations in his controversial writings against Manichaeism, especially that against the Manichaean Faustus, in which he argues that the Manichaeans misinterpreted Scriptural passages, giving them a perverted meaning suited to their own purpose.²

Clear evidence of the fact that the Manichaeans did make use of the Scriptures, more particularly the New Testament, has been furnished within the last thirty years by a remarkable discovery in Central Asia, amid sand-buried ruins in the Oasis of Turfan. In that remote region there was unearthed a considerable mass of actual Manichaean documents, though only fragmentary in form. Lost for ages among the shifting sands, they now throw a flood of light upon "The Religion of Light," as Mānī called the synthetic faith of which he was the founder.³

¹ Concerning the influence of Judaism and Christianity upon Manichaeism, thus involving the O. T. as well as the N. T., see, for example, J. C. Baur, *Das manichäische Religionssystem*, p. 356-368 f., Göttingen, 1831 (reproduced, Göttingen, 1928); also consult the introductory sketch by A. H. Newman in the translation of St. Augustine by R. Stothert and A. H. Newman, in P. Schaff's *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, 4. 22-27, New York, 1909 (orig. ed., 1887); and later likewise I. Scheftelowitz, *Die Entstehung der manichäischen Religion*, p. 34-40, Giessen, 1922; H. J. Polotsky, "Manichäismus," in Pauly-Wissowa, *Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, Supplementband VI, p. 265-267.

² A rather full list of O. T. and N. T. allusions by the Manichaean Faustus, as cited in St. Augustine's *Contra Faustum*, has been brought together below, in n. 21. A few references to Bible subjects, O. T. and N. T., are found grouped in the index of subjects by Stothert and Newman, *op. cit.* 4. 659, column 2, besides those given in their footnotes to the particular passages concerned.

³ Cf. Jackson, *Researches in Manichaeism*, p. 3-4, New York, 1932 (Columbia Univ. Press). Since 1932 there have appeared the important fragments contained in Andreas-Henning, *Mitteliranische Manichaica aus*

From Albīrūnī we know that Mānī, in founding his eclectic religion, acknowledged three spiritual leaders as his direct predecessors, namely, Zoroaster, Buddha, and Jesus.⁴ Traces of the influence of each of these are also distinctly to be recognized in the Turfan texts, whether preserved in Middle Persian, Turkish, or Chinese. As an example to show this, a short Turfan Pahlavi Fragment, M. 173, has been selected for treatment in the present article.

The text of this fragmentary excerpt (M. 173) that shows traces of Biblical influence is found in the noted, though incomplete, collection of Manichæan Fragments, first deciphered and translated by the late F. W. K. Müller, *Handschriften-reste in Estrangelo-Schrift aus Turfan*, II. Teil, p. 78 top, Berlin, 1904.⁵ In his necessarily brief introductory note to this Fragment, Müller had merely space to remark that the piece occupies the badly preserved upper half of a large leaf containing alphabetically⁶ arranged verses, the

Chinesisch-Turkestan, I, II, III (*Sitzungsberichte der Preuss. Akad. d. Wiss., Phil.-Hist. Kl.*, 1932, p. 175-222; 1933, p. 294-363; 1934, p. 848-912).

⁴ See C. Edward Sachau, *Chronology of Ancient Nations*, translated from Albīrūnī, p. 190 top, London, 1879: "In the beginning of his book called Shābūrkan, which he composed for Shāpūr b. Ardashir, he [Mānī] says: 'Wisdom and deeds have always from time to time been brought to mankind by the messengers of God. So in one age they have been brought by the messenger called Buddha, to India, in another by Zarādusht to Persia, in another age by Jesus to the West. Thereupon this revelation has come down, this prophecy in this last age, through me, Mānī, the messenger of the God of truth to Babylonia.' In his Gospel, which he arranged according to the twenty-two letters of the alphabet, he says that he is the Paraclete [cf. John, 14: 16 and 26; 15: 26; 16: 7] announced by the Messiah, and that he is the seal of the prophets (i.e. the last of them)." We can now compare, from the recently discovered Manichæan material in Coptic, Mānī's own mention of his three predecessors, Jesus, Zarades (*sic*) and Buddha, in the opening portion of the *Kephalaia*, p. 7-8, 12 (ed. Carl Schmidt, *Manichäische Handschriften der Staatlichen Museen Berlin, Band I, Kephalaia*, p. 1-98, Stuttgart, 1935). See also Carl Schmidt and H. J. Polotsky, "Ein Mani-Fund in Ägypten," *Sitzb. d. Preuss. Akad. d. Wiss., Phil.-Hist. Kl.*, 1933, p. 4-90, at p. 58-59.

⁵ Published as an *Anhang zu den Abhandlungen der Königl. Preuss. Akad. d. Wiss. vom Jahre 1904*, Berlin, 1904.

⁶ Remains of other alphabetic hymns have been preserved in Turfan Pahlavi. See instances referred to in Mü. *Handschriften-reste*, 2. p. 8, and Waldschmidt and Lentz, *Die Stellung Jesu im Manichäismus*, p. 117 (*Abh. Preuss. Ak. Wiss. Jahrgang 1926*, Berlin, 1926). In the Bible we may

first two of which, comprising four lines, he prints in Roman transliteration, with a provisional rendering in German. Four years later (1908), the Russian Iranist Carl Salemann (also since deceased), in his valuable work, *Manichäische Studien I*, p. 20,⁷ reproduced Müller's Romanized transliteration, but transcribed it into Hebrew letters. This transcript Müller re-collated for him with the original text. The verification corresponded with Müller's transliteration, even to the doubtful word *šahrēyārān*; but for this latter noun Salemann has plausibly conjectured to read *šahrđ(?)ārān*, as referred to in my Notes below. This reading I have adopted, marking it with a raised plus sign (+), which I prefix also to two words, **ustōmēn* and **uspūr*, in the spelling of which I depart slightly from Müller's **istūmin*, **ispūr*, as explained likewise in the Notes.

Müller's text (p. 78) of the four lines is divided by Salemann, p. 20 (from whom we may differ, however), into four verses of 4 + 8 syllables, as follows:

*Ālēf naṣvēn tō xvadāi ° 'ūd Tā *ustōmēn*
*pad tō angad ° 'ūd būd *uspūr tō kām qērbaḡ*

Bagān harv///[ē]n 'ūd šahrđ(?)ārān ° yazdān rōšanān
*'ūd ardāvān ° daḡ(?)///[ēnd] *stāvišn pad vas kādōš*

But it is equally possible, and is favored likewise by the punctuation circles (°) in the original, to regard the piece as composed in the common old Iranian octosyllabic meter, so frequently occurring in Manichaean texts and recalling, even in the occasional rhythmical freedom, the eight-syllable versification of many metrical passages in the Avesta.⁸ Personally I prefer to adopt the octosyllabic

recall the alphabetic Psalm CXIX, Aleph to Tau, each section of which, devoted to a single letter, comprises eight verses. For other instances of alphabetically arranged Manichaean hymns, see Walter Henning, "Ein manichäischer kosmogonischer Hymnus," in *Nachrichten d. Götting. Gesellschaft. d. Wiss., Phil.-Hist. Kl.*, 1932, p. 214-228; *ib.*, "Geburt und Entsendung des manichäischen Urmenschen," *ibid.* 1933, p. 306-318; also the series of poetical texts published in Andreas-Henning, *Mitteliranische Manichaica, III*, p. 862-890.

⁷ This important work by Salemann, *Manichäische Studien I*, appeared in the *Mémoires de l'acad. impér. des sciences de St. Pétersbourg*, sér. 8, vol. 8, no. 10, 1908. It contains an excellent glossary.

⁸ Concerning the octosyllabic verse in Avestan, see K. Geldner, *Über die Metrik des jüngeren Avesta*, p. 1-57, Tübingen, 1877, especially p. 74 ff.,

rhythm⁹ and to arrange the Fragment in two stanzas of three lines each, reminiscent also of the Vedic Gāyatrī, as follows:

1. *Ālēf*¹⁰ *naṣvën tō xvadāñ*¹⁰ °
2. *‘ūd Tā* ° *“(u)stōmën*¹¹ *pad tō angad*¹² °
3. *‘ūd būd* ° **uspūr*¹³ *tō kām qērbag*¹⁴

comparing the Gāyatrī verse. For recent investigations of metrical texts in Middle Persian, both Zoroastrian and Manichaean, see E. Benveniste, “Le texte du *Drast Asūrik* et la versification pehlevie,” in *JA.* Oct.-Dec. 1930, p. 193-225; id. “Le *Mémoriale de Zarēr*,” *JA.* Apr.-June, 1932, p. 245-293; and the two articles by Henning cited above, n. 6.

⁹ As long ago as August 18, 1921, I had penciled on the margin of Müller's text (p. 78) that the lines were in eight-syllable verse. This was prior to coming across Salemann's scheme of 4 + 8 syllables. Support for my view as to octosyllabic rhythm has since become available in the article by E. Benveniste, in *JA.* Oct.-Dec. 1930, p. 220 (cited in the preceding note), who regards the meter of this passage similarly: “Il s'agit manifestement de six octosyllabes.”

¹⁰ *Ālēf*....*xvadāñ*: the double *āñ* is merely an orthographic device to indicate the long vowel; the final *āñ* of *xvadāñ*, on the other hand, is to be read as two syllables, with the diphthong resolved as *āñ*.

¹¹ *“(u)stōmën* (written *‘stvmyn*, Mñ. *‘istūmin*): compare Av. *ustama-* (Skt. *uttama-*), “ultimus, last,” see Bartholomae, *Zum Altiran. Wörterbuch*, p. 51, 79 f., 147, 151. For the spelling ‘*st*’ for ‘*ust*’, we may compare the writing of the prefix ‘*us*’ with an ‘*ayin*’ (as in ‘*zdyh*’ for ‘*uzdēh*’, “exile,” which is also written ‘*vzdyh*’) recorded in the list of words in Salemann, *Man. Studien*, I, p. 104. Such variations of ‘*iz*’, ‘*us*’ in writing doubtless represent attempts to indicate the “indistinct vowel” initially before the two consonants involved. See Bartholomae, *Zur Kenntnis d. mittelliran. Mundarten*, 5.42 top, in *Sitzb. Heidelberger Ak. Wiss., Jahrgang 1923*. As to the meter here, the initial weak vowel of ‘(u)stōmën’ is elided, running together with the preceding *Tā*.

¹² *angad*: the verbal form *angad*, from **angadan* (Av. *ham* + *gam*, “to come together, unite”), is probably to be taken here as the past tense, even though Salemann, *Man. Stud.* I, p. 54 bot., seemed to hesitate between, “*praet.* (oder ists pte.?).”

¹³ **uspūr* (Mñ. *‘ispūr*): here rightly dissyllabic as shown by its derivation from older **us-purna-*. This etymology is fully borne out by Bartholomae, *Zur Kenntnis der mittelliranischen Mundarten VI*, p. 45, n. 1 (in *Sitzb. Heidelberger Akad. d. Wiss. Abhandl.* 6, p. 45, n. 1, Heidelberg, 1925), who recorded concerning the lack of the initial *u* in Book-Pahlavi as follows: “Das Fehlen des ursprünglichen Anlautsvokals (*u*) in mpB. *spurr*, arm. *LW. spar* ist auffällig. Ich erkläre es mir so: Für altes **uspurna-*, **usparna-* war *əsp*° eingetreten, im MPersT. *šsp*° geschrieben; die Schreibung anz *ddp*° = ‘*VSP*’ im MPersB. könnte wohl historisch sein.” See also above, n. 11, on ‘*ustōmën*’.

¹⁴ *qērbag*: the punctuation circle (°) is omitted after this word and also

4. *Bagān*¹⁵ *harv*///[ē]n 'ūd *šahrđ*(?)*ārān*¹⁶ °
5. *yazdān rōš(a)nān* 'ūd *ardāvān*¹⁷ °
6. *dah*(?)///[ēnd] 'stāvišn *pad vas kādōš*

This may be translated, keeping the lines but not reproducing the rhythm, literally thus:

"Aleph (A), the first, (art) Thou, Lord,
And Tā (Ω), the last, has come together in Thee;
(And) fulfilled has become Thy beneficent will (.)"

"The Divinities al[l], also the Rulers,
The Gods radiant, and the Righteous (Elect)¹⁷
Gi[ve] praise with many a 'Sanctus' (*kādōš*)."

after *kādōš* at the end of the next stanza, because not needed since a line-space is left vacant between each of the alphabetic stanzas, as indicated by a long dash (——) in Müller's text. The word itself, which is written often *kērbag* (cf. Salemann, *Man. Stud.* 1, p. 89 bot.), owing to the frequent interchange of *k* and *q* in the TPhl. manuscripts, corresponds to BkPhl. *karfak*, occurring in the common phrase *kār ū karfak*, "deed and meritorious action," but is here best taken as an adjective, cf. Andreas-Henning, *Mitteliranische Manichaica*, III, p. 884, lines 9-10: *harv tavōn qām qērbag 'uspūr būt*, "all thy beneficent will has become fulfilled."

¹⁵ *bagān* . . . *šahrđārān* . . . *yazdān* . . . *ardāvān*: this celestial company of Divinities, Rulers, Gods, and Elect, will be referred to again in the body of the text (p. 203) as paralleling an idea in the Bible (Is. 6: 2-3; Rev. 4: 8 and verses 10-11). In still another Manichaean Fragment, S. 7 recto b 10-17, we have a group comprising "the Angels of light . . . the strong Divinities . . . and the Elect (*vičidagān*, lit. 'Selected Ones') of the Gods" (*frēstagān rōšanān* . . . *ba'ān řahmān* . . . *vičidagān 'ig yazdān*), see Jackson, *Researches in Manichaeism*, p. 129-130.

¹⁶ *šahrđ*(?)*ārān*: see above in the body of the article, p. 200. Müller, in his transliteration (p. 78), read *šahrē*(?)*y*(?)*ārān*, i. e. *šhry*(?)*y*(?)*r'n*. This he repeated, with the same query in his re-collation for Salemann (p. 20 n. 2). As a substitute for that reading, however, Salemann conjectured to restore the parallel form *šahrđ*(?)*ārān*. Both the forms *šahrīyūr* and *šahrđār* occur as dialectic alternatives (plur. as well as sg.) in the TPhl. texts, with the meaning "ruler, rulers," especially in the sense of the company of the rulers of heaven. (See Sm. *Man. Stud.* 1, p. 125 bot., 126 top). I have adopted Salemann's suggestion, *šahrđ*(?)*ārān*, as representing the Northern form of the word, this Fragment being in the Northern dialect.

¹⁷ *ardāvān*: "the righteous, pious ones," a designation of the Elect as distinguished from the Manichaean Auditors. Besides several citations of passages in Sm. *Man. Stud.* 1. 57 mid. (Glossary), see also in the collection

We can recognize at once from its tone and contents that this remnant of a hymn, probably of Mānī's own composition, is in praise of the Supreme Deity, God of that Endless Light to which the Manichaeans turned in adoration. From internal evidence, moreover, we can see in it the influence of the Scriptures.

Striking at once are the lines "Aleph (A), the first, (art) Thou, Lord, and Tā (Ω), the last,"¹⁸ those letters being the beginning and the end of the alphabet of the Syriac language, in which Mānī composed six of the seven books that he wrote, the other, or first book, being in Persian.¹⁹ We see at once that the passage is based upon Rev. 1:8, "I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, saith the Lord," which in turn directly reflects Is. 41:4, "I the Lord, the first and the last; I am he," or again, Is. 44:6, "I am the first, and I am the last;" cf. also Rev. 1:11; 21:6; 22:13.

In our Fragment (lines 4-6), furthermore, the goodly company of "All the divinities and rulers, the gods of light and the righteous (Elect)," ¹⁷ who give praise to the Supreme Deity "with many a Sanctus (*kādōš*)," reminds us of the Tetractys acclaim voiced by the six-winged seraphim in Isaiah 6:2-3, of whom "one cried unto another and said, 'Holy, holy, holy (*qādōš, qādōš, qādōš*) is

of Petersburg (Leningrad) Fragments by Salemann, S. 7 a 11-12, *ardāvān pākān 'i nīyōšāgān*, "the Righteous Pure and the Hearers;" again, S. 7 d 20, *ardāvān 'i nīyōšāg[ā]n*, "the Righteous and the Hearers;" also S. 9 c 9, 21, and likewise elsewhere, cf. Jackson, *Researches in Manichaeism*, p. 81, 115, 129, 131, 138, 157.

¹⁸ We may mention an additional hymn, now available, which is preserved, in whole or in part, in four manuscripts as Fragments M. 83, M. 105a, M. 200, M. 234, see Waldschmidt and Lentz, *Die Stellung Jesu*, p. 117, cf. p. 116. It enumerates the attributes of the "Living Self" (*Grēv Živandag*) in alphabetic order, beginning with *Aržān 'ēš namastēg*, "Worthy art Thou of adoration," etc., and continues by ringing changes in its ascription of praise down to lines 25-26:

tō tō 'ēš grēv vazurg
naorvēr 'ēš 'ād '(u)stōmēr

"Thou, thou art the Self Supreme,
First thou art, and thou the last."

It would be tempting to read the first of these two lines as beginning *tau tō*, and to translate as "Tau thou art;" but it is hardly likely that the Hebrew name of the last letter of the alphabet would be used in preference to the Syriac one in a Manichaean text.

¹⁹ For this statement about the respective languages (Persian and Syriac) consult an-Nadīm's *Fihrist*, translated into German by G. Flügel, *Mani*, p. 102 mid.; text p. 72 mid.

the Lord of hosts; the whole earth is full of his glory," also recalling the echoing cry of the four beasts in Rev. 4:8, "Holy, holy, holy, Lord God Almighty," and the worship by the four and twenty elders (Rev. 4:10-11) paying homage to the throne of God.

Moreover, in three other Manichaean hymns preserved in Turfan Pahlavi, this pious ejaculation *kādōš* or *qādōš*, "Holy!" (*q* and *k* interchanging often in the Manichaean manuscripts), appears as a thrice repeated acclamation or twice uttered refrain. Thus in Fragments M. 75, 331, 544 (= Mū. p. 70-71), consisting of verses in adoration of the Father and his Greatness and lauded Sovereignty, we find the Tersanctus reiterated a dozen or more times. For example, M. 75 recto (Mū. p. 70), where the meter is uncertain, we have:

qādōš qādōš qādōš
 [ʾō] tō š[ah]rdārēft ʾistāvādag °
qādōš qādōš qādōš ʾō tō pīdar °
qādōš ʾō tō nām vižīdag °
qādōš qādōš qādōš ʾō tō pīd °
kādōš kādōš [kā]dō[š]

"Holy, holy, holy,
 Unto Thy sovereignty hymned in praise!
 Holy, holy, holy, unto Thee, Father!
 Holy to Thy name elect!
 Holy, Holy, Holy, unto Thee, Father!
 Holy, Holy, Holy!"

The verso side of that same incomplete leaf repeats thrice the identical ascription of praise (*qādōš*) to the Divine Father. Similarly does also M. 331 recto (= Mū. 2. p. 71), again and again.

These Biblical parallels to our own Fragment, M. 173, and the other Fragments cited with the Tersanctus refrain, are sufficient to show the influence of the Scriptures upon Mānī. In the present instance, passages in Isaiah and those based upon them in the Revelation are most concerned. At first glance one might be inclined to regard Isaiah as the source. Mānī, an Iranian by blood but writing six of his seven books in Syriac,¹⁹ may well have been acquainted with Hebrew and with the common Tersanctus, *qādōš*, *qādōš*, *qādōš*, of the Jewish liturgy through contact with the Babylonian Jews.²⁰ But far more likely is the influence of the New

²⁰ Cf. I. Scheftelowitz, *op. cit.* (n. 1 above), p. 34.

Testament. This may well be assumed not only from the New Testament quotations by Mānī or his followers found in Saint Augustine,²¹ but more particularly because we now have citations

²¹ I have made a fairly complete list of both O. T. and N. T. allusions (direct or to be inferred from the context) found in the speeches placed upon the lips of Faustus in Augustine's *Contra Faustum*, many of which are noted also in the English translation of that work by Stothert and Newman, referred to above in n. 1 end. Such instances are as follows:

1. From the Old Testament.—*C.F.* 4.1 (allusion to the Jews and Canaan, circumcision, sacrifice, swine's flesh unclean, Sabbath), Gen. 17: 8, 9, Lev. 11: 7, Lev. 19: 3 etc.; 6.1 *et passim* (adverse to certain passages in O. T.); 20.17 mid. (a quotation from Ps. 79: 9, "Help us, etc.," freely translated); 23.1 (Ex. 33: 4, "son of Nun," and Hag. 1: 1, "son of Joseph, the high priest").

2. From the New Testament (numerous).—*C.F.* 2.1, "the book of, etc." and "the gospel of, etc.," (quotations from Matt. 1: 1 and Mark 1: 1); 3.1, allusions to Matthew and Luke, with quotations from Mark and John (Mark 1: 1; John 1: 1); again, *C.F.* 5.1, reference to those who abandon family, wealth, etc., taking with them only a mere sufficiency, without thought for the morrow (Matt. 19: 29; Mark 10: 29, 30; Luke 18: 29, 30; also Matt. 6: 31, 34), all such shall receive the blessings of the gospel (Matt. 5: 3-11); furthermore, 5: 1 alludes also to John the Baptist and Jesus, including likewise the quotation, "The blind see, etc." (Matt. 11: 2-6); moreover, we have in the same book, *C.F.* 5.3, quite a number of direct quotations from the gospels in the following order, Matt. 7: 21, Matt. 28: 19, 20, John 15: 4, John 15: 10, Matt. 5: 3-10, Matt. 25: 35 (including an allusion to Matt. 25: 31-46, the importance of which latter allusion, because of the use of the passage in the actual Manichaean Fragments, is pointed out below, n. 22).

Later on, *C.F.* 17.1 mid., the allusion by Faustus to Jesus calling Matthew from the receipt of custom, is a verse quoted directly from Matt. 9: 9; similarly his citation (*C.F.* 18.1) of the words of Jesus, "I came not to destroy the law, but to fulfil it," is taken directly from Matt. 5: 17. In still another passage, *C.F.* 19.2 beg., which is worth quoting in full because of its N. T. quotations, Faustus herein alludes to three laws, namely: (1) "that of the Hebrews, which the apostle calls 'the law of sin and death' (Rom. 8: 2). (2) The second is that of the Gentiles, which he calls the 'law of nature'. 'For the Gentiles', he says, 'do by nature the things contained in the law; and not having the law, they are a law unto themselves, who show the work of the law written on their hearts' (Rom. 2: 14, 15). (3) The third law is the truth of which the apostle speaks when he says, 'The law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death' (Rom. 8: 2)."

Furthermore, may be cited in *C.F.* 20.2 beg., "the light which Paul calls the 'light inaccessible'" (cf. 1. Tim. 6: 16, "the light which no man can approach")—an idea in itself perhaps as old as the Avesta, *avarəno avaretem*, "the glory inaccessible" (lit. "untasteable"), though that

from, or adaptations of, several portions of the Gospels²² preserved in the veritable Manichaean documents, even though no actual pieces from the Book of Revelation have yet been found, or at least have not as yet been made available. Nevertheless, later discoveries

point need not be pressed, even if the "Word of the Apostle Paul" (*govišn 'i Pāūlis frē[stag]*) is referred to in a Manichaean Fragment, S. line 15 (see *Sm. Man. Stud.* 1, p. 32 bot., cf. p. 108 bot., and esp. Salemann, *Ein Bruchstück Manich. Schrifttums*, in *Mém. Acad. Impér. des Sc. de St. Pétersbourg*, 1904, ser. 8, vol. 6, no. 6, p. 2, p. 6 n. 15).

In conclusion, *C.F.* 20.5 near beg., "The things which the Gentiles sacrifice, etc." (quoted from 1 Cor. 10:20); 20.17 mid., "Forgive us our debts, etc." (from the Lord's Prayer, Matt. 6:12); 23.1 mid., "the book of the generation of, etc." (from Matt. 1:1, as above *C.F.* 2.1); 24.1 entire, "the old man," and "the new man" (cf. Rom. 6:6, Eph. 4:22, 24, Col. 3:9, 10); *C.F.* 26.2, reference to healing of the blind, etc. (cf. John 9:1-38); *C.F.* 30.1, "Some shall depart from the faith, etc." (quotation from 1 Tim. 4:1-3); 31.1, "Unto the pure, all things are pure," and "They profess to know God, etc." (quoted from Tit. 1:15, 16); *C.F.* 33.1 beg., "Many shall come, etc." (quoted entire from Matt. 8:11).

In addition to the material presented above from Augustine, we may note that the *Acta Archelai* of Hegemonius, with its reputed account of the argument between Manichaeus or Manes (Mānī) and Bishop Archelaus before the judges at the house of the rich Marcellus, furnishes similarly a number of direct quotations from the Scriptures, or passages with a Biblical coloring. Among the first of such instances we find an example in *Acta Arch.* ch. 5 (6).1, in the letter from Mānī, handed by his disciple Turbo to Marcellus, which begins, "Manichaeus, the apostle of Jesus Christ." Cf. TPhl. Frag. M. 17 verso (Mū. HR. 2. p. 26 bot.), in red letters, an *Mānī prēstag 'ig Yisō*, "I Mānī, the apostle of Jesus." Farther on, in *Acta Arch.* ch. 12.1, Turbo, when recounting the views of his master, Mānī, regarding the creation of Adam, cites him as differing from the statement in Gen. 1:26, "Let us make man in our image, after our likeness." Moreover, when Manes (Mānī) himself enters to speak before the Judges, we have from his lips a whole series of Biblical citations: *Acta Arch.* ch. 15 (13). 3, 5, 6; and 16 (14). 1; also ch. 21 (19). 1 and 6; 28 (25). 1; 32 (28). 4; 33 (29). 1 and 6; 28 (25). 1; 32 (28). 4; 33 (29). 1, 2, and 7; 54 (47). 21; 55. 1, 4, 5, 6; 59 (50). 3 and 6. The precise Biblical reference for each of these citations by Manes (Mānī) is available in the excellent edition of this work by C. H. Beeson, *Hegemonius, Acta Archelai*, p. 5-86, Leipzig, 1906. Sufficient evidence, therefore, is found in both Hegemonius and Augustine to show Mānī's acquaintance with the O. T. and especially the N. T.

²² As examples of Manichaean Fragments that show the influence of the Gospels (especially of Matt. chaps. 24-25) we may refer to several relatively long TPhl. pieces, though broken and incomplete, relating to the Final Judgment and the End of the World. These are collected and translated in my Presidential Address, *JAOS* 50 (1930). 182-197. Still another

or further publication of the fragmentary treasures in Berlin may hereafter shed new light on this interesting subject.

In conclusion, we may feel justified in seeing the influence of the Scriptures upon our present Manichaean Fragment, M. 173, as in the case of several other Manichaean Fragments.



instance from the Gospels is the rather long TPhl. Frag. M. 18 (Mü. 2. p. 34-36), containing a condensed and paraphrased account of Christ before Pilate and events after the crucifixion, based on Matt. chaps. 27-28:1; Mark ch. 15-16:1; Luke ch. 23-24; John 18:29 f. Compare also Frag. M. 132 recto and verso (Mü. 2. p. 36-37) for a similar description of the Pilate passages in substance, especially Matt. 27:11, 27-30; Mark 15:2, 17-19; Luke 23:3, 11; John 18:36, etc.

Numerous citations or reminiscences of N.T. passages are to be found also in the Coptic Manichaean texts so far as published; cf. Polotsky's notes to his translation of the texts in *Manichäische Homilien* (Stuttgart, 1934), p. 10, 13-15, 27-29, 38, 68, 91, and to that of the *Kephalaia*, p. 12-15, 17, 19, 35, 40, 58.

THE PRESENT STATUS OF OLD PERSIAN STUDIES

ROLAND G. KENT

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

THE CUNEIFORM inscriptions of the Achaemenian kings, composed in Old Persian, form a limited corpus of texts of peculiar interest and value: they were the first to be deciphered of the cuneiform writings; they give historical data of much importance; they are the gateway, through the accompanying versions in Akkadian and Elamite, to the decipherment of the cuneiform writings in general.

With Rawlinson's publication in 1846 of the great inscription of Behistan, the values of 35 of the 36 syllabic characters had been established. Within a few years from this time, practically all the Old Persian inscriptions had been found and published that were known up to 1900;¹ and thus for about fifty years scholars worked chiefly on their better interpretation, grammatical and semantic.

With 1900 came a new era. The Behistan inscription was examined in part by our fellow-member A. V. W. Jackson, in 1903;² and a complete and definitive record of the same was made in 1904 by L. W. King and R. C. Thompson, of the British Museum.³ New and better photographs of the Nakš-i-Rustam inscriptions were published in 1910.⁴ The papyrus fragment with an Aramaic translation of a portion of the Behistan inscription was published in 1911.⁵ At this time, accordingly, there were published not merely a number of treatises and articles on special matters,

¹ Except some seal and vase inscriptions, and that of Artaxerxes found at Hamadan (Weissbach, *Keilinschr. d. Ach.* 126-127).

² *JAOS* 24.77-95 (1903), reprinted in *Persia Past and Present* 186-212 (New York, 1906).

³ *The Sculptures and Inscriptions of Darius the Greek on the Rock of Behistūn in Persia*, pp. lxxx + 223 and 16 plates (London, 1907).

⁴ Sarre and Herzfeld, *Iranische Felsreliefs: Aufnahmen und Untersuchungen von Denkmälern aus alt- und mittelpersischer Zeit* (Berlin, 1910); the photographs in this, and other photographs, were utilized by Weissbach, *Die Keilinschriften am Grabe des Darius Hystaspes* (Leipzig, 1911; *AbkSGW* 29.1.1-54, with 8 plates).

⁵ E. Sachau, *Aramäische Papyrus und Ostraka aus einer jüdischen Militär-Kolonie zu Elephantine* (Leipzig, 1911; *AbkSGW* 29.187-205, with plates); cf. also Sachau, *StPAW* 1909.1295, F. Altheim, *ZfV* 3.37 (1924), and E. Cowley, *Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century B. C.*, 248-71 (Oxford, 1923).

but several volumes of comprehensive character and permanent value: H. C. Tolman's volume⁶ of the transcribed Old Persian texts, with English translation and a glossary which included etymological material; E. L. Johnson's word concordance;⁷ F. H. Weissbach's transcribed texts in the three languages,⁸ with a composite German translation and a comparative glossary of the names; A. Meillet's detailed grammar,⁹ descriptive and historical.

These works form the end of one period of Old Persian studies, and the beginning of another period in which there appeared only brief articles on details of interpretation.¹⁰ No new materials became available¹¹ until 1926, when an inscription of Darius was found at Hamadan, in duplicate on gold and silver tablets.¹² In the same year Herzfeld found at the same place a short inscription of Artaxerxes II, which he published in 1928.¹³ In 1929 Scheil published the Achaemenian inscriptions which had been found by the French excavators at Susa,¹⁴ and had been held awaiting pub-

⁶ *Ancient Persian Lexicon*, pp. 134 (New York, 1908; *Vanderbilt Oriental Series* No. 6).

⁷ *Index Verborum to the Old Persian Inscriptions*, pp. 51; printed in the same volume, after H. C. Tolman, *Cuneiform Supplement* (New York, 1910; *Vanderbilt Oriental Series* No. 7).

⁸ *Die Keilinschriften der Achämeniden*, pp. lxxxiv + 160 (Leipzig, 1911).

⁹ *Grammaire du Vieux Perse*, pp. xx + 232 (Paris, 1915); cf. *BSLP* 19. 175 (1915). E. L. Johnson, *Historical Grammar of the Ancient Persian Language*, pp. xiv + 251 (New York, 1917; *Vanderbilt Oriental Series* No. 8), is a convenient work, but less important; cf. reviews by Meillet, *BSLP* 21. 207-8 (1919), and Kent, *AJP* 39. 322-3 (1918).

¹⁰ These are given in the general bibliography listed at the end of this article.

¹¹ Except the vase with "Artaxerxes the King" in OP, Akk., Elam., and Eg., published by N. Giron in *RAs*. 18. 143-5 (1921); and the (later) material found in the Turfan manuscripts.

¹² J. M. Unwalla, in *Jame Jamshed*, Sept. 30, 1926; E. Herzfeld, *DLZ* 47. 2105-8 (Oct. 28, 1926); Sidney Smith, *JRAS* 1926. 433-6; C. D. Buck, *Lg.* 3. 1-5 (1927); L. H. Gray, *JRAS* 1927. 97-101; J. M. Unwalla, *JCOI* 10. 1-3 (1927); F. H. Weissbach, *ZfA* 37. 291-4 (1927); E. Schwentner, *ZfA* 6. 171-3 (1928); E. Herzfeld, *Memoirs of the Archaeological Survey of India*, No. 34, 7 + iii pp. (1928); L. D. Barnett, *JRAS* 1930. 452; R. G. Kent, *JAOS* 51. 229-31 (1931); W. Brandenstein, *WZKM* 39. 74-6 (1932).

¹³ *Altorient. Stud. B. Meissner zum 60. Geburtstag 1928 gewidmet* = *Mitteil. d. altorient. Ges.* 4. 85-6 (1928); also W. Brandenstein, *WZKM* 39. 92-4 (1932), R. G. Kent, *JAOS* 51. 231-2 (1931).

¹⁴ *Inscriptions des Achéménides à Suse*, pp. 101, 11 plates (Paris, 1929; *Mémoires de la Mission Archéologique en Perse*, tome xxi); reviewed by

lication; they were sixteen in number, among them one of first-class importance, describing the building of the palace at Susa by Darius.¹⁵ In 1930 Scheil published a short fragment of another copy of the Suez inscription of Darius.¹⁶ In the same year Herzfeld published two inscriptions from Hamadan, one purporting to be of Ariaramnes,¹⁷ the other a short inscription of Xerxes.¹⁸ In 1931, in the course of the excavations at Persepolis, conducted by the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, there was found a long and important inscription of Xerxes, published by Herzfeld in 1932.¹⁹ In the same year A. W. Davis published the Old Persian inscriptions which he had discovered in the South Tomb at Persepolis,²⁰ the sculptures and their labels matching those of the National Types at Nakš-i-Rustam. In 1933 A. H. Sayce published a small glazed tile inscribed on both sides, with three short lines of Old Persian characters.²¹ In the same year, there was published in facsimile a short but interesting inscription of Xerxes, found at Persepolis.²² Also in the same year, Scheil published another volume of Achaemenian records found at Susa,²³ among which were

Unwala, *JCOI* 17. 79-83 (1930), Benveniste, *RCr.* 97. 481-2 (1930), Weissbach, *AfOF* 7. 35-45 (1931). Cf. also notes 31-33, *infra*. J. M. Unwala, *The Ancient Persian Inscriptions of the Achaemenides found at Susa*, pp. 42 (Paris, 1929), is but Scheil's texts with English translation, an introduction, and a partial glossary.

¹⁵ See note 33.

¹⁶ *BIFAO* 30. 292-7 (1930); also Brandenstein, *WZKM* 39. 76 (1932).

¹⁷ *AMI* 2. 117-27 (1930; rev. by F. Sarre, *OLZ* 35. 673 [1932], H. W. Bailey, *BSOS* 6. 765-8 [1931], J. C. Tavadia, *JCOI* 22. 24-5 [1932]); *Berliner Museen, Berichte aus d. preuss. Kunstsammlungen* 52. 3. 52-5 (1931); also H. H. Schaeder, *SbPAW* 1931. 635-45; W. Brandenstein *WZKM* 39. 13-9 (1932).

¹⁸ Herzfeld, *AMI* 2. 115-6 (1930); Brandenstein, *WZKM* 39. 83 (1932).

¹⁹ *AMI* 4. 117-39 (1932); *A New Inscription of Xerxes from Persepolis*, pp. 14 (Chicago, 1932; *Oriental Institute Series, Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilization* No. 5); also, E. Benveniste, *BSLP* 33. 2. 144-56 (1932); F. H. Weissbach, *ZfA* 41. 319-21 (1933); R. G. Kent, *Lg.* 9. 35-46 (1933); H. H. Schaeder, *SbPAW* 1935. 496-506; J. C. Tavadia, *BCOI* 27. 16-20 (1935).

²⁰ *JRAS* 1932. 373-7, with Plates 2-3.

²¹ *AfOF* 8. 225 (1933).

²² *The Illustrated London News*, April 8, 1933, p. 488; E. Benveniste, *BSLP* 34. 1. 32-4 (1933); R. G. Kent, *Lg.* 9. 229-31 (1933).

²³ *Inscriptions des Achéménides*, pp. 109-29, with three plates, in *Mémoires de la Mission Archéologique de Perse*, tome xxiv- (Paris, 1933); rev. by E. Benveniste, *BSLP* 34. 3. 44-5 (1933).

additional fragments of the *Record of Darius's Palace*,²⁴ more copies of the inscription of Artaxerxes II,²⁵ and a new inscription of Darius, dealing with the restoration of order in the empire.²⁶ In 1934, Herzfeld published an inscription of Artaxerxes, found on four silver dishes, whose place of finding and owner are not given.²⁷ On February 9, 1936, through a newspaper release,²⁸ the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago gave out a certain amount of information about further finds of Old Persian inscriptions at Persepolis, including Herzfeld's translation of Xerxes's account of the suppression of revolts shortly after his accession to the throne. Finally, I. Dyen has just published²⁹ a forged Old Persian inscription which is in private possession in Philadelphia.

The addition of this material has stimulated scholars in the field. The larger publications are the two volumes of texts edited by Scheil;³⁰ the collection of the texts by Brandenstein, which includes all three languages;³¹ my own collection of the Old Persian texts, accompanied by a concordance;³² the editions of the *Record of Darius's Palace at Susa*, by König³³ and by Herzfeld.³⁴ And especially, Benveniste has brought out a revision of Meillet's *Grammar*, dated 1931,³⁵ in which he utilized the newly discovered

²⁴ Cf. R. G. Kent, *JAOS* 54. 34-40 (1934).

²⁵ Cf. V. Scheil, *op. cit.* xxi. 91-3; R. G. Kent, *JAOS* 54. 50-2 (1934).

²⁶ Cf. R. G. Kent, *JAOS* 54. 40-50 (1934).

²⁷ *AMI* 7. 1-9, with 4 plates (1935); cf. H. H. Schaeder, *SbPAW* 1935. 489-96.

²⁸ *The New York Times*, Feb. 9, 1936, 2nd news section, page 8; also in *The University of Chicago Magazine* 28. 4. 23-5 (Feb., 1936). Dr. John A. Wilson, Acting Director of the Oriental Institute, informs me by letter that the account, as printed, "represents substantially our interpretation of these texts."

²⁹ See notes 14 and 23, above.

³⁰ *JAOS* 56. 91-3 (1936).

³¹ *WZKM* 39. 7-97 (1932).

³² *JAOS* 51. 189-240 (1931), rev. by A. Meillet, *BSLP* 32. 3. 86-7 (1931), J. C. Tavadia, *JCOI* 27. 25-6 (1935); cf. also *JAOS* 53. 1-23 (1933), 54. 34-52 (1934).

³³ F. W. König, *Der Burgbau zu Susa nach dem Bauberichte des Königs Dareios I*, in *Mitt. d. Vorderasiat.-Aeg. Ges.* 35. 1. 1-76 (1930), with 16 plates; rev. by F. H. Weissbach, *AfO* 7. 35-45 (1931), F. W. v. Bissing, *OLZ* 35. 111-4 (1932), G. Furlani, *Riv. degli Studi Orientali* 13. 432-4 (1932). Also, W. Brandenstein, *WZKM* 39. 28-39 (1932), and my own articles listed in note 32, treat this inscription.

³⁴ *AMI* 3. 29-124 (1931); rev. by F. Sarre, *OLZ* 35. 673 (1932), H. W. Bailey, *BSOS* 7. 409-11 (1934), J. C. Tavadia, *JCOI* 22. 25 (1934).

³⁵ A. Meillet, *Grammaire du Vieux-Perse*, 2e éd., corrigée et augmentée

material to that date, including also the borrowed words in the Aramaic papyri.

We cannot however consider any of these as final, for there are, as we have seen, new inscriptions appearing almost every year, and we now await impatiently the publication of those found at Persepolis. In the meantime, some remarks of general or specific character may be in place.

In the recent newspaper release³⁶ we have Herzfeld's translation into English of two inscriptions of Xerxes, found at Persepolis. The shorter of these was found in four copies: it stands on two gold tablets and two silver tablets, one of each being found in each of two carefully cut limestone boxes, found in situ in two corners of the great audience hall of the palace. In each box were also six gold and silver coins. The translation duplicates the translation of the text on the gold and silver tablets found by a Persian near Hamadan, and published by Herzfeld in 1926.³⁷

The other inscription of which we have Herzfeld's translation in the newspaper, is also of Xerxes, and has much more valuable content. Except for slight variations caused by the fact that it is an inscription of Xerxes and not one of Darius, the first three paragraphs, to the beginning of the list of provinces, agree with the first part of the Nakš-i-Rustam inscription of Darius; and the fifth or final paragraph agrees with the fifth paragraph of NRa, containing the invocation which begins *Auramazdā pātuv*. Of the list of provinces and the whole fourth paragraph I wish now to speak.

We already had four lists of the provinces ruled by Darius: Bh. 1. 14-7, 23 provinces; Pers. e 10-8, 25 provinces; Susa 21-30, 28 provinces (text restored after the Akkadian version);³⁸ NRa 22-30, 30 provinces; and the present list of Xerxes, 30 provinces,

par E. Benveniste, pp. xxiv + 286 (Paris, 1931); notice by A. Meillet, *BSLP* 32. 3. 85-6 (1931); rev. by J. Bloch, *RCr.* 99.2 (1932), C. N. S., *JRAS* 1932. 1011-4, R. G. Kent, *Lg.* 9. 92-6 (1933), A. Debrunner, *IF* 52. 151-4 (1934), H. Lommel, *OLZ* 37. 178-86 (1934), J. Bonfante, *Emerita* 2. 177-8 (1934), H. W. Bailey, *BSOS* 7. 700-2 (1934), J. C. Tavadia, *JCOI* 27. 20-2 (1935).

³⁶ See note 28.

³⁷ See note 12. The Hamadan tablets were found in situ, according to Herzfeld, *DLZ* 47. 2105-8 (1926), and therefore could not have come from Persepolis, from one of the other corners of the audience hall.

³⁸ See especially Kent, *JAOS* 54. 40-50 (1934).

is the fifth. In making a comparison, it is with the NRA list that we must deal; for while the order is changed, the items of the new list agree more closely with its items than with those of any other list. The differences are the following, with the numerical position in the lists:

Darius NRA	Xerxes Pers.
18 <i>Arabāya</i>	16 <i>Yarunā tyaiy drayahyā</i>
20 <i>Armīna</i>	17 <i>utā tyaiy paradraya</i>
23 <i>Yarunā</i>	18 "Gedrosia"
24 <i>Sakā tyaiy paradraya</i>	19 "Syria"
25 <i>Skudra</i>	23 "the Dahae"
26 <i>Yarunā takabarā</i>	26 "the Macedonians"
29 <i>Maciya</i>	27 "the <i>Akaufaciya</i> "

Certain of the Xerxes items I have left as translated by Herzfeld; it is probable that the Darius items 23 and 26 correspond to the Xerxes items 17 and 16, respectively, but no definite pairing off of the others can be made at this time. "The *Akaufaciya*" are clearly *Akaufaciya*, the inhabitants of a land *Akaufaka*, as the *Maciya* are those of *Maka*; and *Akaufaka* would be "the mountainless land," cf. *kaufa* "mountain" (Bh. 1. 37, 3. 44; Mod. Pers. *kōh*) and *Anāmaka* "the month of the nameless god" (Bh. 1. 96, 2. 26, 2. 56, 3. 63). Such a country would of necessity be placed to the north, in the plains of Southern Siberia, or to the northwest, north of the Caucasus mountains.

The fourth paragraph of this inscription is of extreme interest, and deserves quotation in full in the translation, which alone is available:

"Sayeth Xerxes the King: When I became king, there were among those lands, which are written above, some who rebelled; then, Ahuramazda helped me; by Ahuramazda's will, such a land I defeated, and to their place I restored them; and among those lands were such where, before, the Daivas were worshipped; then, by Ahuramazda's will, of such temples of the Daivas I sapped the foundations, and I ordained 'the Daivas shall not be worshipped!' Where the Daivas had been worshipped, there I worshipped Ahuramazda together with 'Rtam the exalted.—And there were other things which were done wrongfully, such I righted. This what I did, I did it all by the will of Ahuramazda. Ahuramazda helped me, until I had performed the work.—Thou who art of an

after age, if thou thinkest, 'I wish to be happy in life, and in death I wish to belong to 'Rtam,' abide in those laws which Ahuramazda has established and worship Ahuramazda together with 'Rtam the exalted. The man that abides in the laws which Ahuramazda has established and worships Ahuramazda together with 'Rtam the exalted, that one will be happy in life and will, in death, belong to 'Rtam."

Herzfeld's " 'Rtam the exalted " is clearly the Avestan *Aša*, now for the first time met in the Old Persian documents; and any doubt that may have existed as to whether Darius and his successors were Zoroastrians, is dispelled. A further conclusion has been drawn by J. A. Wilson, Director of the Oriental Institute at Chicago, that the continued worship of the *Daivas* (Avestan *daēva*), indicates that the Zoroastrian faith was of recent origin, that therefore Zoroaster lived at about the date which is traditionally assigned to him, and the *Vištāspa* who was his convert and protector was *Vištāspa*, or *Hystaspes*, father of Darius. This inference seems to me to be unwarranted. The traditional date of Zoroaster's death is 583 B. C., and *Hystaspes's* father *Arsames* was living in 521, when Darius, son of *Hystaspes*, came to the throne. To justify the inference, it would be necessary to bring Zoroaster down some decades later.²⁰ On the other hand, it would be entirely possible, and in fact probable, that a Zoroastrian ruler should speak of all non-Zoroastrian deities as *daivā*; and there is no evidence that the Persian rulers were fanatical to the extent of extirpating other "false" religions. Cyrus's treatment of the Jews after the capture of Babylon, for example, was notably generous. Any revolt against the constituted authority was likely in those days to be led by religious leaders; witness the revolts against Darius, described in the Behistan inscription, in which the *Drauga* or "Lie," the Avestan *druj-*, was active (1. 34, 4. 34-7, cf. *Dar. Pers.* d 17-20). I understand the passage in the new inscription as meaning, there-

²⁰ For the *Vištāspa* who was Zoroaster's convert and protector to have acted in these capacities, he must have been at least twenty-five years old at the time of his conversion, which preceded the death of the prophet by a number of years. At the least, then, *Vištāspa* was perhaps forty years old in 583, the traditional date of Zoroaster's death, and would have been about one hundred years old when his son Darius came to the throne in 521; but at that time *Vištāspa's* father, *Aršāma* (*Arsames*), was still living, according to the *Record of Darius's Palace at Susa*, and the long inscription of *Xerxes* (see note 19)!

fore, that when Xerxes came to the throne, certain rebellions developed, led or sponsored by the priests of non-Zoroastrian religions which had been allowed to persist up to that time, either under a policy of tolerance, or because the provinces in question had only recently come under Persian rule, and therefore little change in religious matters had taken place; that when the rebellions were suppressed, Xerxes destroyed the temples of the infidels and instituted the worship of Ahuramazda in their place. For this, there is no necessity of regarding Zoroaster as a contemporary of Xerxes's grandfather.

Another phenomenon of recent years is the appearance of a number of inscriptions which are of very dubious character, even if not certainly forgeries. Prominent among these is the inscription of Ariaramnes, great-grandfather of Darius; despite Herzfeld's defense ⁴⁰ of its genuineness, Schaefer ⁴¹ and Brandenstein ⁴² have established that it was engraved in the first half of the fourth century B. C., probably to accompany a statue or other representation of Ariaramnes.

Similarly, the inscription on four silver dishes, published by Herzfeld in 1934, ⁴³ has been branded by Schaefer ⁴⁴ as a modern forgery because of the appearance of *sa-i-ya-ma-ma* = *siyamam*, evidently in the meaning "made of silver," for which the OP word would have been **ardatainam* (cf. *ardatam* "silver," in the *Record of Darius's Palace at Susa*); *siyamam* seems to be an attempt to make an OP word from Mod. Pers. *sim* "silver," from Greek *ἄσημος* by borrowing into Mid. Pers. as *asim*. This error is virtually decisive; *batugara* "dish" (acc.) is almost as difficult; the other errors are writings which might be matched in inscriptions of the fourth century. On the other hand, it is curious that a forger should make four identical copies of the same forged article; unless indeed he figured that, as many of the Old Persian documents were found in more than one copy, there would be greater credibility in an inscribed object of which there were four copies rather than one or even two.

The glazed tile published in 1933 by Sayce ⁴⁵ is inscribed on both sides; as the characters in each of the three lines form parts

⁴⁰ *AMI* 4. 132-9 (1932); cf. J. C. Tavadia, *JOOI* 27. 16-7 (1935).

⁴¹ *StPAW* 1931. 635-45.

⁴⁴ *StPAW* 1935. 489-96.

⁴² *WZKM* 39. 13-9 (1932).

⁴⁵ See note 21.

⁴³ See note 27.

of well-known words, but are not connected with each other, such a tile could have been useful only if placed in a series with others. In such a position one side or the other would be covered, and invisible. The tile can be only a forgery, based on the portions of tiles found at Susa, which seem to have formed a frieze around the walls of the great hall;⁴⁶ but the maker of the forgery combined with the idea of an inscribed glazed tile the usual writing on both sides of a baked clay tablet.

To these dubious documents must be added that published by Dyen,⁴⁷ who demonstrates that it is a forgery.

In view of the small number of OP inscriptions, it is important to eliminate from their corpus those which are not what they purport to be. The late date of the so-called inscription of Ariaramnes is essential for another aspect of OP studies: the date of the origin of this syllabary. From the simplicity of the syllabary—3 vowels, 22 consonants with inherent *a*, 4 consonants with inherent *i*, 7 consonants with inherent *u*, a word divider in two forms, 5 ideograms—it has obviously been devised at royal command, by a scribe skilled in the more complicated Akkadian and Elamite writing, for the engraving of imperial records.⁴⁸ Of Darius I we have an abundance of inscriptions in this syllabary; of Xerxes, a goodly number; of later kings, down to Artaxerxes III, a few. But there are only two which purport to be of earlier date than Darius I: that of Ariaramnes,⁴⁹ which is a genuine piece of two centuries after Ariaramnes, and another from Murghab, bearing the name of Cyrus. This short inscription,⁵⁰ "I (am) Cyrus the King, an Achaemenian," has been read in five places on the columns etc. of a palace at Murghab; there is no evidence which is decisive that it belongs to the Great Cyrus (died 529) rather than to the Younger Cyrus (died 401). We may therefore believe that Darius I was

⁴⁶ Scheil, Vol. 21, no. 12, pp. 53-5 (1929); cf. Kent, *JAOS* 51.218-20 (1931), 53.2-3 (1933).

⁴⁷ See note 29. Likewise, a steatite relief representing a predecessor of Darius I, with an Elamite inscription, which was published by J. Lewy in *ZDMG* 82. liv-lvi (1928), has been regarded as a forgery by D. Opitz, *AfO* 5. 168-70 (1929).

⁴⁸ Outside of imperial records we have, in the OP syllabary, only a few seal inscriptions.

⁴⁹ See notes 17, 40, 41, 42.

⁵⁰ Given by Weissbach, *Keilinsch. d. Ach.* 126; cf. also LXVII-LXIX.

speaking the truth when he inscribed at Behistan,⁵¹ that by the will of Ahuramazda he had made inscriptions in Aryan, in a way which had not been done before.

Returning to the list of provinces, I wish to consider the province *Maka*, whose inhabitants were *Maciyā*. Weissbach has shown that on the Nakš-i-Rustam inscription, among the national types of the empire, the Akkadian *Qa-du-ma-a* corresponds to OP *Maciya*; ⁵² it follows then, as he has pointed out to me in a letter, that in the Susa list the name *Maka* (or *Maciyā*) is to be set in place no. 12, where I set *Kaduš*, in imitation of the *Qa-du-ú* in the Akk. version. I wish then to list this name in its environment in each of the lists :

Dar. Bh.	Dar. Pers.	Dar. Susa	Dar. NRa	Xerxes Pers.
19 <i>Gadāra</i>	20 <i>Ōataguš</i>	10 <i>Harauvatiš</i>	10 <i>Harauv.</i>	4 <i>Harauv.</i>
20 <i>Saka</i>	21 <i>Harauv.</i>	11 <i>Ōataguš</i>	11 <i>Ōataguš</i>	13 <i>Ōataguš</i>
21 <i>Ōataguš</i>	22 <i>Hiđuš</i>	12 <i>Maka</i>	12 <i>Gadāra</i>	20 <i>Gadāra</i>
22 <i>Harauvatiš</i>	23 <i>Gadāra</i>	13 <i>Gadāra</i>	13 <i>Hiđuš</i>	21 <i>Hiđuš</i>
23 <i>Maka</i>	24 <i>Sakā</i>	14 <i>Hiđuš</i>	14 <i>Sakā ha.</i>	24 <i>Sakā ha.</i>
(end)	25 <i>Maka</i>	15 <i>Sakā haumavargā</i>	15 <i>Sakā ti.</i>	25 <i>Sakā ti.</i>
	(end)	16 <i>Saka tigrasaudā</i>	26 "Macedonians"
		27 <i>Putiyā</i>	27 <i>Akaufaciya</i>
		27 ???	28 <i>Kušiya</i>	28 <i>Putiyā</i>
		28 <i>Karkā</i>	29 <i>Maciyā</i>	29 <i>Karkā</i>
		(end)	30 <i>Karkā</i>	30 <i>Kušiya</i>
			(end)	(end)

It will be seen that in the first three lists *Maka* is in the same group of lands, which Dar. Pers. characterizes as *dahyāva tyaiy paruvaiy* "provinces which are in the East," while in NR *Maciyā* it is set in a very different group, placed at the end of the list, and including otherwise only names which do not appear in Bh. or in Dar. Pers. In the list of Xerxes's provinces the name does not appear at all, unless it be that which Herzfeld has translated "Macedonians"; but so long as the original text is not before us, we are not entitled even to make such a conjecture. At any rate, *Maka* does not occur in the Xerxes list in the relative position in which it is found in any of the other lists. Its position in the

⁵¹ OP version 4. 89-90, too badly mutilated for restoration and translation; but the text is preserved in the Elamite version, in a section formerly called Fragment L.

⁵² *AbkSGW* 29.1.50 (1911; see note 4, above). Davis (see note 20) found the same correspondence of names at Persepolis.

earlier lists suggests that it was located in the East near Gandara and the Sattagydes (*@atagus*), but no similar name is known from that region; the name *Maka* suggests either the later name Makran or Mekran for the southern part of Baluchistan, or the *Mákai*, who dwelt anciently in Arabia south of the Gulf of Oman, in the region of modern Mascat. But the Akk. equivalent suggests also the *Cadusii*, to the west of the Caspian Sea, just north of the Sagar-tians; *Asagarta*, as well as *Maka*, was included in the list of eastern provinces. At the present time a definitive identification of the land *Maka* seems to be impossible.⁵³

The restoration of *Maka* in position no. 12 in the Susa list leaves position no. 27 vacant; the Akk. text fails here also, though the former presence of a name is shown by the determinative for a country. Comparison with other lists shows that the missing name was either *Putiyā* or *Kušiyyā*, or the name of the corresponding country.

Whatever doubt may remain about the position of *Maka*, the land *Kuša*, as a province of the Achaemenian Empire, is definitely Ethiopia. At an earlier period, in the Akkadian documents, the same name was applied to the country occupied by the Kassites, around Babylon; but at the time which interests us, *Kuša* is a remote province, forming one of the boundaries of the empire of Darius, as given in the gold and silver tablets found in the corners of the audience hall at Persepolis, as well as on the duplicates published by Herzfeld in 1926:⁵⁴ the empire extended from the Seythians (*Sakā*) who are beyond Sogdia, to Kush, and from the Indus-land to Sardis. Further, *Kuša* was one of the sources of the ivory used in the decoration of Darius's palace at Susa; the other countries which furnished it were the Indus-land and Arachosia.⁵⁵

⁵³ For position in the East, see E. Herzfeld, *AMI* 3. 61 (1931), and F. W. Weissbach, *ZfA* 43. 281 n. (1936); for identification with the *Cadusii*, see F. W. König, *Burgbau* 19 (1930; see note 33) and *Der Alte Orient* 33. 3-4. 51 (1934), and R. G. Kent, *JAOS* 54. 45 (1934). On the identification with Makran, see A. V. W. Jackson, in *The Cambridge History of India* 1. 338 (1922); for that with the *Mákai*, see Grohmann's article on *Makai*, in Pauly-Wissowa, *Real-Enc. d. class. Altertumswiss.* 14. 614-5 (1930), with references for this identification as far back as 1875 (Sprenger, *Die alte Geographie Arabiens* 124). Despite Eilers, *OLZ* 38. 205 n. 2 (1935), *Maciyyā* can hardly be other than the ethnic to *Maka*; cf. Meillet-Benveniste, *Gram.* 107, 153 (1931; see note 35).

⁵⁴ See notes 28 and 12, respectively. Ethiopia and India appear as the limits of the empire of Ahasuerus, in *Esther* 1. 1 and 8. 9.

⁵⁵ Lines 43-5 of the *Record*; see notes 30, 32, 33. 34.

The *Karkā*. (Akk. *Kar-sa*, Elam. *Kur-qa-ap*) have been variously identified; they stand at the end of the provinces in the Susa and NR lists of Darius, and in that of Xerxes they seem to be the "Carians," in the penultimate position. In the *Record of Darius's Palace at Susa* they are associated with the Ionians in the transport of cedar timbers from Babylon to Susa.⁵⁵ The identification as Carians has been current for some years,⁵⁷ and is now established with apparent finality by W. Eilers, who treats the problem in great detail in an article published in 1935.⁵⁸

The name of Susiana, *Uvaja*, appears thus written in many passages (*u-va-ja*), as well as in the ethnic derivative; but in the *Record of Darius's Palace at Susa*, line 46, both in the main copy and in Frag. e, we find the locative *u-ja-i-ya* = *Ujaiy*. While the omission may be here an error,⁵⁹ the two identical writings *Ujaiy* being due to copying from the same original, there is also the possibility that *u-va-ja* stands for *uv-* "well," Skt. *su-*, + *ja-* "born," as in Skt. *divi-ja-* "twice-born," and that the land *Uv-ja*, the well-born country or country of the well-born, retained the spelling of the first part⁶⁰ as though it were a separate word; cf. *paruv-nām*, gen. pl. for *paruv*.

In Darius's inscription of Susa, on the *Restoration of Order in the Empire*,⁶¹ line 44 begins *karubim*, meaning, as the context clearly shows, "weak" or "poor." Several friends have by letter⁶² called my attention to the fact that this should be restored with *ša* at the end of the preceding line, since the stone has lost the right-hand edge, and there would be room for one more letter; this gives

⁵⁵ Lines 33-4 of the *Record*; cf. R. G. Kent, *JAOS* 51.205-6 (1931).

⁵⁷ So J. M. Unvala, *Anc. Pers. Insc.* 40 (1929; see note 14); E. Herzfeld, *AMI* 3.60 (1931). Herzfeld earlier, in *Iranische Felsreliefs* 106 (1910; see note 4), took them to be Carthaginians, and König, *Burghau* 19 (1930; see note 33), identifies them with the Cilicians. Cf. also A. Christensen, *Iranier* 254 (1934).

⁵⁸ *OLZ* 38.201-13 (1935), with bibliography; also H. H. Schaeder, *Archäol. Anzeiger, Beiblatt zum Jahrb. d. Deut. Arch. Instituts*, 47.270-4 (1932).

⁵⁹ G. G. Cameron, in a letter of March 30, 1934; cf. also Hübschmann, *Persische Studien* 214 (1895), Foy, *KZ* 35.62 (1899), *KZ* 37.542 (1904).

⁶⁰ Such writing is not found in any other compound of this element; but cf. F. H. Weissbach, *AfOF* 7.43 (1931).

⁶¹ See notes 23 and 26.

⁶² C. J. Ogden, writing on March 26, 1934; H. H. Schaeder, on April 1, 1934; F. H. Weissbach, on April 22, 1934.

[ša]kauθim, to be equated with the Turfan Pahlavi škvh = iškōh "poor." With this is to be associated šakauri[m] Bh. 4. 65, which must have a very similar meaning; whether we attribute the consonantal variation to difference of suffix or to error in writing, is here unimportant.

On [ismar]uv, Dar. *Record* 51, which I adopted⁶³ after Herzfeld's text, a suggestion has been made⁶⁴ to me that both this word and the Elamite is-ma-lu are borrowed from the Akk. iśmāru = Heb. hašmal, supposed to be some metal, probably bronze; the word recurs in the Ras-Shamra texts as azmar.

In connection with the collection of the OP inscriptions, which I published in this JOURNAL⁶⁵ shortly after the appearance of Scheil's Volume XXI, and somewhat before Brandenstein did the same for the inscriptions in all three languages,⁶⁶ I wish to call attention to some differences between our two versions. I accept Brandenstein's restoration⁶⁷ of Scheil's 16 E, as correct, and also his interpretation⁶⁸ of the second Ahuramazda ideogram in Scheil 9, line 4, as a ligature for AM-ha. On Scheil no. 28, the full and correct version is now available,⁶⁹ since other copies have been found filling out the gaps; neither Brandenstein⁷⁰ nor I⁷¹ had reached the proper conclusion. On Scheil's no. 1, the *Record of Darius's Palace at Susa*, the best combinations of all the materials are to be found in my second and third articles.⁷² There are many other differences between our versions, and careful comparison should be made before accepting one rather than the other.

Out of all this, we have in recent years made many gains in our knowledge of the Old Persian. We have added to our stock of texts, largely by those inscriptions found at Susa and published by Scheil, and by those found at Persepolis and Hamadan and published by Herzfeld. We have gained new words, new forms, new syntactical combinations; and these have illuminated the texts which were

⁶³ JAOS 53. 21 (1933).

⁶⁴ J. A. Montgomery, in a letter dated November 27, 1934.

⁶⁵ JAOS 51. 189-240 (1931).

⁶⁶ WZKM 39. 7-97 (1932).

⁶⁷ Pages 66-8.

⁶⁸ Page 53; with Herzfeld, AMI 3. 46 (1931).

⁶⁹ Kent, JAOS 54. 50-52 (1934).

⁷⁰ Pages 89-92.

⁷¹ JAOS 51. 228-9 (1931).

⁷² JAOS 53. 1-23 (1933), 54. 34-40 (1934).

known before. Notably among the syntactical idioms we now know that the accusative *mām* is correct in *yaθā mām kāma*⁷³ and the like; and that the nominative clause may follow an accusative, as in *Vištāspam hya manā pitā*.⁷⁴ And as both these are assured in the inscription in which Xerxes tells of his accession,⁷⁵ where also other new words are used, we know that Old Persian was in the days of Xerxes still a truly living language⁷⁶—a fact which will be further demonstrated when we have the original text of the inscription in which Xerxes relates his conflict with the worshippers of the *daiuā*. We have gained certain identifications of provinces, and new historical facts: for example, that when Darius assumed the throne both his father Hystaspes and his grandfather Arsames were living;⁷⁷ that Xerxes worshipped not only Ahuramazda but also *Artā*,⁷⁸ the Avestan *Aša*, whence the conclusion is inescapable that Darius and his line were Zoroastrians, not merely Mazda-yasnians of some other variety.

At the present moment, those who are interested in the Old Persian field have two major emotions: first, their feeling of loss and sorrow at the death of Professor Breasted, under whose experienced guidance the excavations at Persepolis have been carried on, with its harvest of Old Persian cuneiform inscriptions; and second, the desire that as soon as possible these inscriptions should be edited and published by Professor Herzfeld, that they may be accessible to us all. It is fitting that this issue of this JOURNAL, dedicated to the memory of Professor Breasted, should contain a review of the studies made in the Old Persian field, where the next advance will come with the aid of those inscriptions which were found by his associates in the excavations made under his direction, on behalf of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago.

⁷³ Found complete Bh. 4. 35-6, and elsewhere in mutilated form.

⁷⁴ Restored in the *Record of Darius's Palace at Susa*, line 58, by König (see note 33), whose text I here accept, *JAOS* 53.8 and 23 (1933).

⁷⁵ Lines 21-3 and 29-30; see note 19.

⁷⁶ As Schaeder justly remarks, *SbPAW* 1935. 504.

⁷⁷ So in the *Record*, lines 12-5 (cf. note 70), and in the long Xerxes inscription, lines 16-25 (see note 19).

⁷⁸ See p. 214, above.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL APPENDIX

The literature of the Old Persian inscriptions is to be found in various places:

F. W. Weissbach, *Die Keilinschriften der Achämeniden* (Leipzig, 1911), in the introduction of which practically all previous work is listed and evaluated.

Indogermanisches Jahrbuch, beginning with 1912, but lacking some items, notably from 1914 to 1920.

J. H. Kramers, *A Classified List of the Achaemenian Inscriptions*, pp. 12, reprinted from the *Annual Bibliography of Indian Archaeology for 1931* (Leiden, 1933), containing the bibliography of the separate inscriptions from 1911 to 1932.

But there are still gaps, and it seems worth while to give here a complete bibliography (as nearly as possible) of Old Persian studies from 1912 to the present time. It is sometimes difficult to decide whether or not an item belongs here by its subject matter; for any faulty inclusions or exclusions indulgence is asked. But the author would appreciate information of any items which have been missed by him.

The items are classified by the year of appearance; those already cited in footnotes are here given only by reference to the footnotes. The following abbreviations are used for journals and series, both in the bibliography and in the footnotes:

AbhSGW = *Abhandlungen der königl. sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften, phil.-hist. Kl.*

AfO = *Archiv für Orientforschung.*

AJA = *American Journal of Archaeology.*

AJP = *American Journal of Philology.*

AJSL = *American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures.*

AMI = *Archäologische Mitteilungen aus Iran.*

BIFAO = *Bulletin de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale.*

BSLP = *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris.*

BSOS = *Bulletin of the School of Oriental Studies, London.*

DLZ = *Deutsche Literaturzeitung.*

IF = *Indogermanische Forschungen.*

JAOS = *Journal of the American Oriental Society.*

JCOI = *Journal of the Cama Oriental Institute.*

JRAS = *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, London.*

KZ = *Zeitschrift für Vergleichende Sprachforschung, begründet von A. Kuhn.*

Lg. = *Language.*

MSLP = *Mémoires de la Société de Linguistique de Paris.*

OLZ = *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung.*

PAPA = *Proceedings of the American Philological Association.*

RAs. = *Revue d'Assyriologie.*

RCr. = *Revue Critique d'Histoire et de Littérature.*

SbPAW = *Sitzungsberichte der preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, phil.-hist. Kl.*

TAPA = *Transactions of the American Philological Association.*

WZKM = *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes.*

ZDMG = *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft.*

ZfA = *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie.*

ZII = *Zeitschrift für Indologie und Iranistik.*

1912: G. Hüsing, "Wō, Wai, Wišta, ein altpersisches Adjektiv und seine Steigerung," *OLZ* 15. 537-41; A. Meillet, "Persica," *MSLP* 17. 352-6 (on ending of 3d pl. imperf., *vašnā*); A. Meillet, "Sur les Groupes de Consonnes en Vieux Perse," *MSL* 17. 368-70; H. C. Tolman, "Identification of the Ancient Persian month Garmapada in the Light of the Recently Found Aramaic Papyrus Fragments," *AJP* 32. 444-5.

1913: L. H. Gray, "On the Aramaic Version of the Behistan Inscriptions," *JAOS* 33. 281-4 (on Bh. 1. 65); A. Meillet, "Le Relatif en Perse," *MSLP* 18. 242-4; M. E. Pereira, *Iscrição de Dario o Grande*, pp. 93 (Coimbra); A. Śmieszek, *Rozprawy Krakauer Ak.* III, 6 (51) 114-33 (studies on the OP inscriptions, in Polish); H. C. Tolman, "The Grave Relief of King Darius," *AJA* 17. 85-6; F. H. Weissbach, "Zur Kritik der Achämenideninschriften," *ZDMG* 67. 271-341.

1914: A. Meillet, "Sur la Notation du *š* en Vieux Perse," *MSLP* 18. 380; H. C. Tolman, "The Grave of King Darius at Naksh-i-Rustam," *Madressa Jubilee Volume* 166-72 (Bombay; edited by J. J. Modi); H. C. Tolman, "Does *yawnā takabārā* (Dar. N.Ra) signify 'Shield (i. e. Petasos)-wearing Ionians'?", *PAPA* 44. liii-lv; J. Wackernagel, "Indoiranica," *KZ* 46. 275-80 (on *āvā*, *yāvā*).

1915: see note 9. C. Bartholomae, "Über ap. *amudāh*," *KZ* 47. 292-5; E. W. Fay, "Indo-Iranian Word-Studies," *JAOS* 34. 330-1 (on *māniyam*); G. Hüsing, "Altp. *āmudā*," *KZ* 47. 169.

1916: A. Meillet, "Persica," *MSLP* 19. 49-59 (on *iyam*, *dim diš*, *hyā-param*, *rauta*, *uta*, *hrbānam*); "À propos de (h)*uāasma* en Vieux Perse," *MSLP* 19. 348-9.

1917: see note 9. R. G. Kent, "Studies in the Old Persian Inscriptions," *JAOS* 35. 321-52 (on *avahyarūdiy*, *taumā*, *apariyāya*, *hacā daršam* Bh. 1. 50, *ušabārim*, *šim* Bh. 4. 6, *ufrāštūdiy*); H. C. Tolman, "The Graphic Representation of Final Indo-Iranian *a* in Ancient Persian," *PAPA* 47. xxix-xxx.

1918: see note 9. K. B. Erman, "Ἀρεμβάρης," *KZ* 48. 159-60; G. Hüsing, "Altpersisch *abi-ā-čariš*?", *KZ* 48. 155-6; A. V. W. Jackson, "The Etymology of Some Words in the Old Persian Inscriptions," *JAOS* 38. 121-4 (on *amudā*, *aruvastam* . . . *niyasaya*); A. H. M. Stonecipher, *Graeco-Persian Names*, pp. viii + 86 (New York; *Vanderbilt Oriental Series* No. 9; rev. by R. G. Kent, *AJP* 39. 323 [1918], A. Meillet, *BSLP* 21. 207-8 (1919)).

1919: see note 9, and above under 1918.

1920: R. G. Kent, "The Textual Criticism of Inscriptions," *JAOS* 40. 289-99 (on the orthography of Bh.).

1921: see note 11. J. Friedrich, "Die altpersische Stelle in Aristophanes' 'Acharnern' (v. 100)," *IF* 39.93-102 and 231; R. G. Kent, "Addendum on a Difficult Old Persian Passage," *JAOS* 41.74-5 (on *šim* Bh. 4.6); H. C. Tolman, "Persian Words in the Glosses of Hesychius," *JAOS* 41.236-7; J. Wackernagel, "Zu der altpersischen Stelle in Aristophanes' Acharnern," *IF* 39.224.

1922: see note 53.

1923: see note 5. J. Charpentier, "Der Name Kambyzes (*Kambūjiya*)," *ZII* 2.140-52; V. Lesny, *Sborník Prací Filologického* 67-9 (*Festgabe für F. Groth*, Prag; on the OP verse in Aristophanes, in Czechish); G. Morgenstierne, "Iranian Notes," *Acta Orientalia* 1.248-53 (on *Bābiruš*, Bh. 1.64-5, 1.86, 2.94, 3.26, *Vindafar[nū]*, Bh. 4.49, *ufrastādiy*, *abāhāvaja*, Bh. 5.30, *martihyā* Art. III Pers. a); P. Tedesco, "Iranica," *ZII* 2.40-1 (on *aspabāri*).

1924: see note 5. P. Haupt, "Epenthesis of *i* in Old Persian," *JAOS* 44.157-8 (on *Pātišuvāriš*); F. W. König, "Altpersische Adelsgeschlechter, I. Die Dātuhijān," *WZKM* 31.287-309; E. Schwentner, "Die Wortfolge im Altpersischen," *ZII* 3.23-32; J. R. Ware, "Old Persian *niyāθrārayam*," Bh. 1.64," *JAOS* 44.285-7; F. H. Weissbach, "Altpersische Aufgaben," *Streitberg Festgabe* 376-85 (Leipzig).

1925: A. V. W. Jackson, "Avesta *urvatō* and Old Persian *ušabārim*," *Indo-Iranian Studies Sanjana* 18-20 (Leipzig); W. K. Šileiko, *Žizn Museja* 1.17-9 (Moscow; on the seal of Artaxerxes, in Russian); J. R. Ware and R. G. Kent, "The Old Persian Cuneiform Inscriptions of Artaxerxes II and Artaxerxes III," *TAPA* 55.52-61 (on the orthography).

1926: see note 12. R. G. Kent, *The Textual Criticism of Inscriptions* 8-16 (Philadelphia; *Language Monograph* No. 2 of the Linguistic Society of America; on the orthography of Bh.); F. W. König, "Altpersische Adelsgeschlechter, II. Die Wṛkanijān," *WZKM* 33.23-53; János Szidarovsky, *Történeti Szemle* 12.48-91 (Budapest, in Hungarian; on the inscriptions of Darius I).

1927: see note 12. U. Kahrstedt, "Smerdis," in Pauly-Wissowa, *Real-Encyc. d. Altertumswiss.* 3A.710-2.

1928: see notes 12, 13. J. Friedrich, "Metrische Form der Altpersischen Keilschrifttexte," *OLZ* 31.238-45; F. W. König, "Altpersische Adelsgeschlechter, III. Die Suhrijān," *WZKM* 35.1-35; E. H. Sturtevant, "The Misuse of Case Forms in the Achaemenian Inscriptions," *JAOS* 48.66-73.

1929: see note 14. É. Benveniste, "Sur la Syntaxe du Vieux-Perse," *MSLP* 23.179-83 (on the anacolutha and Bh. 1.62-71); E. Herzfeld, "Der geschichtliche Vištāspa," *AMI* 1.77-124, "Der awestische Vištāspa," *AMI* 1.169-85 (rev. by F. W. König, *AfOF* 7.121-2 [1931]; see also under 1930); A. V. W. Jackson, "Indo-Iranian Notes," *Indian Studies in Honor of Lanman* 254-7 (Cambridge; on Bh. 1.21); M. Semper, "Nicht-Arisches im alten Persertum," *Ephemerides Orientales* 37.1-14; J. M. Unvala, "The Palace of Darius the Great and the *apadāna* of Artaxerxes II in Susa," *BSOS* 5.229-32; O. G. von Wesendonk, "Zu altpersisch Auramazda," *ZII* 7.189-93.

1930: see notes 12, 13, 16, 17, 33, 53. É. Benveniste, "Persica," *BSLP*

30. 1.58-74 (on the new inscriptions of Scheil, vol. xxi; dating formulas; *aurā* Dar. Pers. e 22; *handugām* Bh. 4.55, 4:57); R. Bleichsteiner, "Altpersische Edelsteinnamen," *WZKM* 37.93-104 (on *kapautaka*, *sikabariya*, *aššina*); E. Herzfeld, "Zarathustra," *AMI* 2.1-112 (rev. by H. W. Bailey, *BSOS* 6.765-8 [1931], J. C. Tavadia, *JCOI* 22.24-5 [1932], F. Sarre, *OLZ* 35.674 [1932]); E. Herzfeld, "Vishtāspa," *Dr. Modi Memorial Volume* 182-205 (Bombay); F. H. Weissbach, "The Old Persian Inscriptions," *Dr. Modi Memorial Volume* 673-705 (Bombay).

1931: see notes 12, 17, 32, 34, 35, 41, and above, under 1929 and 1930. ß. Benveniste, "Persica," *BSLP* 31.2.63-79 (on enclitic pronouns, *artavardiya*, *ašnaiy*, Bh. 2.94, *gaub-*, *patipra-*, *farnah*, *taumā*); Shapurji Kavasji Hodivala, "Cuneiform Inscriptions Transcribed into Sanskrit and Avesta: Behistan Inscriptions," *JCOI* 19.58-158; F. Pathier-Bonnelle, *Le Syllabisme des Écritures Antiques*, pp. 53 (Paris; rev. by M. Cohen, *BSLP* 33.3.184-5 [1932]).

1932: see notes 17, 19, 20, 31, 35, 58, and above, under 1930 and 1931. *Photographs of Casts of Persian Sculptures of the Achaemenid Period, mostly from Persepolis* (London, British Museum; rev. by ß. Benveniste, *Journal Asiatique* 220.378-9, H. Hargreaves, *JRAS* 1933.203): L. H. Gray, "Four Old Persian Etymologies," *AJP* 53.67-9 (on *θaramiš*, *yakh*, *sikaba[aa]uda*, *marda*); O. G. von Wesendonk, "über die Verwendung des Aramäischen im Achämenidenreich," *Litterae Orientales* 49.1-10 (rev. by J. Dashian, *Handes Amsoria* 47.209-33 and 382 [1933]).

1933: see notes 19, 21, 22, 23, 32, and above, under 1931 and 1932; also Kramers, *Classified List*, at the beginning of this Appendix. G. Hüsing, *Porušatiš und das achämenidische Lehenwesen*, 2nd ed. (Wien; rev. by A. Christensen, *OLZ* 37.698-9 [1934]); C. J. Ogden, "A Note on the Chronology of the Behistūn Inscription of Darius," *Oriental Studies in Honour of C. E. Pavry* 361-5 (London); A. T. Olmstead, "A Persian Letter in Thucydides," *AJSL* 49.154-61; O. G. von Wesendonk, "The Title 'King of Kings'," *Oriental Studies in Honour of C. E. Pavry* 488-90 (London).

1934: see notes 32, 35, 53, 57, and above, under 1933. A. Debrunner, "Die Flexion der *i-* und *ū-*Stämme im Altpersischen," *IF* 52.131-6.

1935: see notes 19, 27, 35, 40, 58.

1936: see notes 28, 29, 53.

1936: see notes 28, 29, 53. J. Friedrich, "Zur Glaubwürdigkeit Herodots," *Die Welt als Geschichte* 2.108-16 (on the memorial of Darius, Herodotus 3.88); W. Harl, *KZ* 63.13-4 (anaptyxis); E. Herzfeld, *AMI* 8.5-51 (6-17, on the inscription of the four silver dishes, see our note 27; 17-35, on the inscription of Ariaramnes, see note 17; 35-46, on the inscription of Xerxes, see note 19); E. Herzfeld, *BSOS* 8.589-97 (on Cambyses); H. H. Schaefer, *Ungarische Jahrbücher* 15.560-3 (passive forms).

RAS SHAMRA NOTES V

A Myth of a Spring

JAMES A. MONTGOMERY

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

M. VIROLLEAUD has published in *Syria*, 1935, pp. 247-266, a fresh document from Ras Shamra. He entitles it "Les chasses de Baal." The text, in large part defective, is intelligible only in sections, and its unity of subject offers a severe problem. The present exposition is advanced merely as another essay at interpretation.

The accompanying plate presents, in Hebrew transcription of Virolleaud's plate, the text of col. I, 9-41, col. II, 44-62, the intervening lines being omitted on account of their mutilated condition; some references to phrases there contained are included in the study. The several "scenes" are paragraphed for the reader's convenience. References to the earlier texts and transcription method follow the usage adopted in a recent publication of those texts, with the addition that the three Alephs are represented respectively with *a*, *i*, *u*.¹

The writer finds a consecutively intelligible passage at the end of col. II, lines 57-62. To his understanding the subject there is a myth concerning the origin of a holy spring, the water-supply of a sanctuary, the waters of which were used in judicial decisions. Accordingly this study begins at the *finale* with the hope that it may throw light on the earlier course of the drama.

(57) *As first* (58) *I shall set thee, over them* [?] *thou shalt be established.* (59) *I have made thee King of Judgment,* (60) *I have made thee Drawer of the Spring,* (61) *I have made thee Fount of the House of God,* (62) *and Abyss of the House of —.*

For *awl* "first" cf. Arab., and for the root in Hebrew see Ges.-Buhl. — Is *aštlk* error for Energetic *aštnk*? A secondary root

¹ Montgomery and Harris, *Ras Shamra Mythological Texts*, Am. Philological Society, Univ. of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia, 1935. The Glossary given there and also the Glossary in H. L. Ginsberg's admirable edition of *The Ugarite Texts* (in Hebrew; Jerusalem, 1936) present the vocabulary of the hitherto published texts. The writer has again to acknowledge with warm thanks Dr. Harris's kindly offered service in making the plate.

štt appears at Ps. 73:9. — *tīkn*: reflexive from root *kūn*; cf. Aram. formation. — *šibt*: fem. ppl., the function of well-drawing being feminine, e. g. Gen. 29, while the application of the feminine for masculine offices is common in Semitic. — *qr* "fount": cf. Heb. *māqôr* and the verb at 2 Ki. 19:24. — *mšlt*: i. e. *mešûlat*; the interpretation is suggested by the parallels. — *hrš* or *hrš*: with Vir., one must be cautious in identifying with Heb. *hāres*, "sun."

For the well as place of judgment in the Hebrew tradition of the wanderings cf. Wellhausen, *Prolegomena*³, 357 ff. There is the correspondence, probable identification of Kadesh and the Spring of Judgment, Gen. 14:7, and Mē-ribāh, Waters of Adjudication, Ex. 17:7, which latter place Wellhausen assigns as the original scene of Moses' lawgiving. For the sanctity of waters and springs and their part in omens and ordeals see W. Robertson Smith, *Religion of the Semites*, ch. 5. It may be due to such a connection that the city of Dan ("judgment"; the present Tell el-Kaḏi, "Tell of the Judge") was so named because of its proximity to the gushing waters of Leddan; see G. A. Smith, *Historical Geography*, 472 ff. For the sacred, semi-mythical waters that supply and protect Sion cf. Is. 33:21. Ps. 46:5, and see Gunkel's Comm. on the Psalm; Gunkel reads in the former passage *māqôr* for *māqôm*. Much that is *à propos* to the legends connected with such holy waters may be found in G. A. Smith, *Jerusalem*, I, cc. 4, 5.

I return now to the legible portions of Col. I.

(9) *By the judgment of El* — (10) — *shall ye eat*, (11) — *like bitterness shall ye nibble*.

tān: error for *tā*? = Syr. *tādā*, Akk. *šedu*, Heb. *dāšē*, "grass." — *mr̄m*: cf. *mē mārīm*, Nu. 5:18. — The root *qrš* is Akkadian. There is a divine condemnation of some group to a bitter livelihood in desert places.

(12) *El laughs at* (13) *heart and is pleased within himself* [lit. *at liver*]. (14) *Go thou to Tlš (?)*, *O Maid of the Moon*, (16) *to Dgmy (?)*, *Maid of Athirat*. Take (18) *thy settle, thy saddle*, (19) *thy robe, and go* (20) — (21) *Amidst the desert of* (22) *El burrow*, (23) *dig, O Maid*, (25) *Dust the bones of the hand*, (25) *and the skeleton sand*. *To those who* (26) *eat thy blessing!* (27) *and to those who rebel* (28) *Gods curse* (29) *their names!*

ו (9) בדן . הָל . אבן (10) כבדכֹּשֶׁשׁ . תַּמְכֹּל (11) תֵּדן . כֹּם
מֶרֶם . תִּקְרָצוּן

(12) הָל . יִצְחָק . בֶּם (13) לֵב . וַיִּגְמֹשׁ בֶּם כִּבְדֹּ (14) צֹאֵ
אֶת־כְּתֹלֶשׁ (15) אִמֶּת . יִרְחֵ (16) לִדְגָמִי . אִמֶּת (17) אֶתְרֵת . קַח
(18) כֶּסֶם־נֶזֶךְ . חֲדָךְ (19) חֲתֹלֶךְ . וְצֹאֵ (20) בִּמְלֵן . תִּכֶּם (21) בִּתְךְ
מִלְבֵּר (22) הָל שֶׁאֵי (23) כְּרִי אִמֶּת (24) עֶפֶר . עֲצִם יָד (25) הָגֵרִם .
הָלֹד־ (26) אֹכֵלִם . תִּבְרַכְךָ (27) וְלֹד־ . עֶקֶקֶם (28) הָלֵם יִפְעֹר (29) שְׁמֵתָהֶם
(30) בִּהֶם קִרְנִם (31) כֹּם . תֵּרֶם . וּגְבֹתָת (32) כֹּם . הָבֵרֶם (33) וּבִהֶם . פֶּן . בַּעַל

(34) בַּעַל יִתְלַךְ וַיִּצֹד (35) יִחְפֹּאֵת . מִלְבֵּר (36) [פֶּן] . יִמְחִי . אֹכֵלִם
(37) וַיִּמְצֹא . עֶקֶקֶם (38) בַּעַל . חֲמָדִם . יִחְמָדִם (39) בֶּן־דָּגֵן יִהְרָרֶם (40)
בַּעַל . וְגִתָּהֶם . בִּפְעֻנָה [בְּצִנָּה] (41) וְהָלֵה־הֵד . בַּחֲרָצֶעָה

ו (44) בִּנְת־שָׁדִם . צָחַר (45) שִׁבְע־שָׁנָה . הָלֵל־מֶלֶךְ [אֵל] (46) וְתָמֵן .
וְקִפְּוֹתֵי־תֵדֵן . (47) כִּלְבִּישׁ . כְּמִלְפָּשׁ . דָּם [חָה] (48) כֹּם אֵלֵל־דָּם .
אֲרִיָּה (49) כִּשְׁבָּעַת . לִשְׁבָּעִם . אֲחֵה . יִמְצֹאֵן [יִמְצֹאֵן] (50) וְתָמֵנָה . לִתְמָנִים
(51) שֶׁר־אֲחֵיהֶם מִצָּאָה (52) וּמִצָּאָה־שֶׁר־ . יִלִּיָּה (53) בִּסְכָן . סִכְנִים
בַּעַד (54) עֲדָנִים .

כֹּן . נִפְלֵ . בַּעַל . (55) כֹּם . תֵּרֵן . וְתִכְמָס־הֵד (56) כֹּם
הָבֵר בִּתְךְ . מִשְׁמֵשׁ־דֵשׁ .. (57) הֵתֵת ...

לֵאמֹל (58) הֵשְׁתַּתְךְ־לִם . תִּתְכֵּן (59) שִׁתְךְ־מֶלֶךְ־דֵן
(60) שִׁתְךְ־שֶׁאֵבֵת־עֵן (61) שִׁתְךְ־קֵר . בַּתְּהָלֵ (62) וּמִצְלֵת־
בַּת־חֵרֶשׁ [ש]

(30) *On these horns* (31) *like bulls and* — (32) *like steers*; (33) *but on those the face of Baal.*"

The parallelism of "heart" and "liver," which Vir. also finds elsewhere, appears at Ps. 16:9; 108:2, with the reading, long proposed, of *kābēd* for *kābôd*; there is also the parallelism with *nāpeš* at Gen. 49:6, which also appears in our small Tablets, no. 9, 16. — The second verb can be identified with Arab. *jamasa*. — "Maid of Athirat" has appeared at B iv 61, where she is commissioned to build a temple. Novel is her epithet "Maid of the Moon:" is she to be identified with Nikkal-Ningallu, aligned with Sin in the Aram. Nerab inscription? — Vir. finds in *tlš* a verb, root "to knead," but the parallel does not support this; the two vocables may be place-names. — Lines 18 f. Vir. has identified the first noun (a formation from *kissē*), and the third as Heb. *ḥatul-lāh*; the second = Arab. *ḥidj*, used of a woman's camel-saddle. For the camel-mounted woman in Arabian war ritual see Raswan, *Black Tents of Arabia*, ch. 17. — L. 22. The proposed error *mībr* for *mābr* (so Vir.) is repeated at l. 35; as *mābr* occurs in Text C it is unnecessary to suppose a phonetic variation (cf. Brockelmann, *Grundriss*, I, 132). For the "desert of El" cf. *mābr qāš*, C 65. — Lines 22-25. The translation is offered with much reserve; it is based on parallelism, which may well be fallacious. If *kry* be from Heb. *kārāh*, "to dig," its parallel may be explained as from Arab. *ša'a(y)*, with the same meaning. The only sense I can find in the words is that the Maid is to dig a well in the desert, the fount which is celebrated at the end of the text. The reference to "the bones of the hand," etc., may symbolize their wearing out. — Lines 26-33. I must entirely part company with M. Virolleaud, who understands *ld* as impv. of *yalad*, with the consequence that the following named groups are the Maid's offspring. I analyze it as *l* (prep.) + *d* (demonstr.-rel.). The "blessing" (n. b. *tafīl* form) is paralleled by the phrase "curse their names!"; the phrase appeared in the immediately preceding publication of Virolleaud's in *Syria*, XVI, 29 ff., for the writer's study of which see this JOURNAL, vol. 55. 268 ff. (the text also in *R. Sh. Myth. Texts*, No. E). The *'qqm* must then be the opposite of the "eaters," and so the word may be interpreted from Arab. *'aqqa*, with primary sense of "bitter," and then of "rebellion" (cf. Heb. roots *mrr* and *mārā(h)*). The myth appears to offer a story of a divine chastisement of some

offenders, for which they are punished by the hard fare of the desert; there the mercy of El will distinguish between those who are patient, the "eaters," and the "rebels." The theme recalls the epic of the *Bnê Israel* with their enforced penitential wanderings in the desert, and the "rebels" among them who disdain the supply of food and water; e. g. Nu. 11:20, and Moses' chiding of them as "ye rebels," 20:10. The two parties are contrasted below, "on these," "on those," without distinction of pronoun. — Lines 30-32. The symbolism of "horns like bulls" typifies strength; cf. Dt. 33:17, etc. The figure is repeated below for Baal-Had, II, 55 ff. — The vocalization *'ebbîrîm* is noticeable. — The contrary attitude of Baal against the rebels is expression by a phrase similar to Heb. *nātan pānîm b-* (Lev. 17:10; 20:3, 6), which is identical with Akk. *nadānu pānū ana*.

(34) *Baal goes and roams*, (35) *approaches the quarter of the desert*, (36) *So [?] he comes upon the eaters* (37) *and finds the rebels*, (38) *Baal with delights delights them*, (39) *Dagan's Son. . . .*

The combination of the first two verbs has appeared in the earlier texts. The third verb may be assigned to the Heb. root *naḥa(h)*, in intrans. sense as in Arab. — The adverbial *pat mābr* appears at C 63 (cf. the writer's note in the JOURNAL, vol. 55. 66). — Different emphatics are found in the two following similar verbs (cf. Heb. *māšā'*, including the meaning of Aram. *maṭiya*); but cf. II, 51 f. with a single root. — The synonymity of "Baal" and "Dagan's Son" appears at A i 24, etc., both epithets of Aleyan. — At l. 41 appears the title El Had, also at II, 6, 23, and at II, 55 the name is paired with Baal. — The verb "delights (them)" is paired, perhaps in contrast, with *yḥrrm*, which may possibly be interpreted from Arab. *harra*, "to abominate," the objects of the two verbs being the contrasted parties.

Col. II (44) *Within the burnt-regions (?) of the desert* (45) *the seven years of El are full [?]*, (46) *and in the eighth cycle —* (47) *complain [?] his brothers* (48) *as in mourning [?]*, *complain his comrades*. (49) *For seven and seventy his brothers they come*, (50) *and eight and eighty* (51) *the circle [?] of his brothers found him*, (52) *and found him the circle of his followers. . . .*

The initial word I take to be Heb. *bênôt* (Vir., "daughters"). — The second word appears both as here at A iii 17, etc., and as *šdmt* at C 10. If the following word *šhr* means "desert" (cf. Arab. and *šhrrt*, A ii 24), "plantations" and the like as proposed for the earlier cases cannot suit here. At Is. 37:27 occurs *šedēmāh* with variant at 2 Ki. 19:26, *šedēpāh*, "burnt," and that is the meaning desiderated here. Are we dealing with a distinct root with different sibilants, *š* or *ś*? May "Sodom," with Samek, mean "burnt?" — in which case the name is comparable with "Gomorraah," "sunken" (see *JQR* 25.262). — By "the years of El" may be meant the term of his judicial sentence. The word *nqnt* appears on comparison with the parallel to be error for *nqpt*. — Lines 47 ff. *dm* is obscure, the translation is conjectural. The numerical phrases "seventy-to-seventy, eight-to-eighty" occurs at D v 20. The lines from 49 on picture apparently the trooping of Baal's associates to meet him. In l. 51 *šr* may be Heb. *šēr*, "circlet," Akk. *še'ēru*, etc. At end of l. 52 *glyh* in the parallelism may be interpreted from Arab. *waliya*. L. 53 consists of paralleled words; for the root *'dn* in repetition see B v 68; Vir. compares Sum. *edinu*, "plain," a meaning suitable here.

(54) *So alighted Baal* (55) *like a bull, and Had went to work*
(56) *like a steer in* — —

Vir understands the first verb as of a bull falling down with implication of his sacrifice; I take it in the sense of "alighting" from his mount or chariot; cf. Gen. 24:64. — The following verb I identify with Arab. *kamasa*, "to go to work," in form a solitary case of *ta*-preformative, for which in Heb. see Ges.-Kautzsch, §55, h. I. e. Baal-Had set to work with the strength of a bull; does the activity belong to the digging of the well the creation of which is celebrated in the following passage? — L. 56. *btk mšmš* has its equivalent *bmšmš* at II, 37. It may be a bold guess to interpret the noun in line with Sumerian *mašmaš*, used of oracles; but that root may be good Semitic, appearing in Arab. *waswasa*, "to whisper," etc. Then *b/btk mšmš*, "in an oracle," introduces the following address in the second person, doubtless addressed to Baal. And may the following *dš* be filled out to *dšm*, "which he heard?" This brings us back to the final scene studied by way of introduction.

THREE DECREES OF RAMSES III FROM KARNAK

HAROLD H. NELSON

ORIENTAL INSTITUTE EPIGRAPHIC EXPEDITION
LUXOR, EGYPT

ON THE EXTERIOR of the east wall of the little temple of Ramses III which projects into the first court of the great temple of Amon at Karnak is an inscription of fifty-two lines giving an introduction to, and the text of, three decrees which the Pharaoh promulgated during his reign,¹ endowing certain pieces of temple furniture which he made and presented to Amon-Re on different occasions (Fig. 1,² text of decrees without that of introduction). The decrees are dated in the year 16 month 2 of the third season (ll. 8-41), the year 7 (ll. 42-46), and the year 6 (ll. 47-52) respectively, in the case of the two latter no month or season being given. They are thus inscribed in the inverse order to the sequence of their issue, though it is obvious that they were all carved on the building at one time. They do not constitute a temple calendar in as much as they provide for no succession of feasts but merely for the daily offerings to be placed on the objects endowed by them. The seven introductory lines of the inscription concern themselves only with the latest of the decrees, that of year 16, for reasons which will be considered later. While it is impossible within the limits of this article to treat these documents at all exhaustively, it may be worth while pointing out certain aspects of their contents that are of particular interest.

The earliest of the decrees, that of the year 6, reads: "His majesty decrees to establish divine offerings for his father, Amon-Re, king of gods, upon the two great *hnt*-stands of silver and gold which his majesty made newly in the great forecourt (*wb³*) (..... of the temple) of Amon-Re, king of gods." The offerings to be placed on the stands were "4 loaves of white bread, size 8 per *hk³.t*; 12 loaves of white bread, size 12 per *hk³.t*; 20 loaves

¹ See *Oriental Institute Publications*, Vol. XXXV (Reliefs and Inscriptions at Karnak, Vol. II), pl. 108. Chicago, 1936.

² The drawing shown on Fig. 1 is by Mr. Leslie Greener, while that on Fig. 4 is by Mr. Virgilio Canziani. The photographs are by Mr. Henry Leichter. All these gentlemen are on the staff of the Oriental Institute expedition at Luxor.

of white bread, size 10 per *hḳ3.t*; 20 gold *sty*-jars of beer, strength 40 per *hḳ3.t*, making a regular daily allowance of grain of 1 sack. (Also) 4 *dry.t*-baskets of incense; 4 *dry.t*-baskets of fruit, daily, due from the treasury of the House of Millions of Years of Ramses III, who is given life, stability and good fortune like Re forever." On the south wall of the temple terrace,³ the king is shown enumerating his good deeds for Amon. There he states, "I made great *hnt*-stands of gold⁴ for thy rich offerings of every day." In the decree the word *hnt* is inscribed ideographically, merely with a representation of the stand itself, which is written twice, showing that it is a dual and indicating that there were two of these objects with which the decree was concerned. In the text on the terrace the word is again written ideographically, though only once, but with the plural strokes, possibly including thereby other stands besides the two mentioned in the decree.

If we may trust the hieroglyph for the word *hnt* as it is written in Ramses III's inscriptions at both Medinet Habu and Karnak (see Fig. 2), the stand was a wooden structure, the lower part of the body of the ordinary offering table type, but with the rear half of the top raised above the level of the front half so that objects placed on the back of the stand were not obscured by those in front.⁵ On both levels of the top of the stand stood jars which differed in shape with different occurrences of the sign. As far as I can discover, stands of this type are not represented in any of the surviving reliefs. In earlier reigns the stands for jars seem to have been merely flat-topped tables or frames in which the vessels could be securely placed so as not to be easily upset. Such also appears to have been the normal form of the determinative for the word *hnt* before the time of the Twentieth Dynasty. Only at that period is the new shape of the sign found, a change which possibly reflects an innovation in the construction of the object itself or is perhaps merely an example of the realism characteristic of Ramesside hieroglyphs.

The endowment for the two stands consisted of three sizes of white bread 36 loaves in all, and twenty gold *sty*-jars of beer per

³ *Ibid.*, Vol. I, Pl. 34 A, line 23.




⁴ The wall at this point is badly destroyed. It is possible that we are to read "of silver and gold," the usual formula, though this reading is too uncertain to have been included on Plate 34A of the publication.

⁵ See *Oriental Institute Communications*, No. 18, p. 42, no. 31.

day, as well as four baskets of incense and four of fruit. In the Calendar at Medinet Habu the endowment for the single stand there provided * was just half that for the two stands at Karnak, namely, 18 loaves of bread and ten gold *sty*-jars † of beer per day. There were also four baskets of incense, four of fruit and two *šš*-geese daily, in the case of the incense and fruit the one stand at Medinet Habu faring as well as the two combined at Karnak. At the latter temple no geese were provided. The grain used in the preparation of the bread for the stand at Medinet Habu was just half that specified for the two stands at Karnak, namely two *hk³.t* and four *hk³.t* = one sack, respectively. Moreover at Karnak the number of units of each of the items prepared with grain, that is, the bread and beer, is exactly divisible by two, one half presumably for each stand. In the case of the second of the bread items, 12 loaves of size 12 to the *hk³.t*, the number 12 for the loaves is written with two rows of six strokes each, instead of in the usual way with the sign for ten and two strokes. The scribe was probably led into this variation from the normal writing through the knowledge that the bread was to be divided into two parts of six loaves each. Thus the number and kinds of loaves and jars given in the Medinet Habu Calendar seem to be the regulation provision for a *hnt*-stand, and the size of the loaves seems similarly fixed. The other objects with which such stands were endowed could apparently vary.

The word *hnt* is generally translated "jar-stand, drink-stand" and when described in the texts no mention is made of any equipment for such a piece of furniture other than *sty*-vessels of gold and silver for beer and wine. Yet the endowments of the stands both at Medinet Habu and at Karnak include bread and fruit, and, in the case of the former, fowl as well. The drinks seem apparently to have been the outstanding feature of the offerings and perhaps the modifier, "jar" or "drink" may therefore most appropriately be applied to these objects. I have, however, merely transliterated

* See *Oriental Institute Publications*, Vol. XXIII (Medinet Habu, Vol. III), Pl. 142, List 2.

† At Medinet Habu in List 2 of the Calendar the word *sty* is written . In the decree at Karnak it is written . In the latter instance the outline draughtsman who set the copy for the stonecutter seems by an easy mistake to have misread the hieratic form of a writing .

the Egyptian term in view of the evident fact that the stands held food as well as drink. The incense was doubtless used for the ceremonial purification of the offerings. None of these stands seems to have been placed in the shrine directly before the god, but stood in the *wb*³ of the temple, wherever that may have been. This fact accounts for the absence of any representation of stands of the Ramesside type in the temple reliefs of the period, among which, as far as we know, the *wb*³ of the temple is not depicted.

While the temple reliefs do not give us any information regarding the appearance of the *hnt*-stands, there is in tomb 178 of the Theban Necropolis a wall painting^{*} showing a series of tables with offerings (Fig. 3) which may represent objects similar to those made by Ramses III for Amon, though probably smaller and much less sumptuous. The tops of these tables, instead of descending towards the front in a series of steps, seem to slant gradually downward. On the other hand, in the case of the stand on the left, the bottoms of the jars disappear behind the slanting side of the table as though they rested on just such a stepped surface as those shown in the hieroglyphs of Fig. 2. The other three stands, however, do not display this feature. It is possible that we have here objects of the same form as the royal *hnt*-stands but with the steps of the tops masked by side pieces the upper edges of which descend in a continuous plane towards the front. Whether such was their actual construction or whether this peculiarity is the result of faulty drawing is difficult to determine. The round-bottomed jars with which they are furnished, of the same shape as those shown in three of the four examples of the hieroglyph on Fig. 2, would not have stood upright on a slanting surface. In fact, on either a flat or a slanting table top they would have to be steadied by some sort of support. It is interesting to note that all the provisions with which the artist has supplied these stands are included in the endowments of their temple equivalents at Medinet Habu and Karnak.

Although the decree endowing these two stands was carved on the wall of Ramses III's little Karnak building, the stands themselves do not seem to have been intended for that temple. Unfortunately in the text there is a lacuna just where the name of the temple for which they were made occurred. The space thus vacant

* Pointed out to me by Mr. K. C. Seele among his extensive collection of photographs of scenes in the Theban Necropolis.

is not sufficient for the name of the little temple nor are the traces of signs remaining consonant with it, and we are probably to supply some term that applied to the great sanctuary of Amon. Moreover, it does not seem likely that the smaller structure had yet been erected in the year 6 of the reign when the decree was issued and the stands therefore could not have been intended for its equipment.

The second of the decrees, chronologically considered, is that of the year 7. This reads: "His majesty decrees to endow divine offerings which are to be offered to his father, Amon-Re, king of gods, upon the arm of the statue of the king of Upper and Lower Egypt, Ramses III, which is near the great offering table of Amon-Re, king of gods." The offerings are listed as: "10 loaves of *by.t*-bread, size 80 to the $\text{hk}^3.t$; 1 loaf of *psn-hi*³.*t*-bread, size to the $\text{hk}^3.t$; 18 loaves of *psn*-bread, size 40 to the $\text{hk}^3.t$; 2 loaves of *psn-dp.t*-bread, size 10 to the $\text{hk}^3.t$. Total of various breads for the divine offerings, 31; making a daily allowance of grain of 1 sack." The grain is due from the House of Millions of Years of the king of Upper and Lower Egypt, Usermare-Meriamon, in the estate of Amon."

On the opposite side of the temple from that where the decrees are recorded is a relief showing the king officiating at an offering table before the Theban Triad (see Fig. 4). In front of the table, probably beside it in reality, is a stand on which rests a kneeling figure of the king, a little statue, which raises one arm before it in a position common in the ritual, and on the other arm and shoulder bears an 'vessel loaded with bread, of the form of *by.t*- and *psn*-loaves. This is undoubtedly the statue referred to in the decree. It is noticeable that the loaves of bread provided for by the enactment are all very small, as far as the surviving portion of the text indicates, as befitting objects to be placed on such a small support of precious metal.

On the north wall of the hypostyle hall at Karnak, in the upper register, is a scene depicting Seti I kneeling before Amon-Re and

* The amount of grain needed to produce the *by.t*-bread, *psn*-bread and *psn-dp.t*-bread was 31/40 of a $\text{hk}^3.t$. The total amount stated in the decree as required for the four items together was 1 sack or 4 $\text{hk}^3.t$. The amount remaining after subtracting the 31/40 from the 4 $\text{hk}^3.t$ would be 3 9/40. This is an impossible amount and is obviously an error in the record. Unfortunately, the number of loaves per $\text{hk}^3.t$ of *psn-hi*³.*t*-bread is lost in a lacuna so that we cannot control the calculations of the scribe.

bearing on his head an 'vessel of food offerings.¹⁰ The free hand is extended forward towards the god but the action portrayed is lost in a break in the wall. On the west wall of the same hall Seti I is shown offering a statue of silver with an 'vessel on its shoulder and a *hrp*-scepter in its extended hand (see Fig. 5),¹¹ obviously an earlier example of the same kind of offering object as that presented by Ramses III. Such statues, in various attitudes of the cult, were a regular part of the temple equipment and appear not infrequently in the reliefs. Presumably they served as perpetual substitutes for the king when he could not in person officiate at the services.

In the temple of Khonsu at Karnak, on the east wall of the court, Héri-Hor, as king, is shown performing the same act of the cult (see Fig. 6) as is Seti I on the north wall of the hypostyle hall of the Amon temple and the same as do the two little statues just cited.¹² The title of this scene reads: "Presenting (*hrp*) divine offerings to Amon in *Ip.t-šw.t* as regular daily offerings." In this instance the king uses both hands to balance the huge 'vessel on his head. In the temple reliefs where the verb *hrp* is used of the action portrayed, the officiant regularly holds the *hrp*-scepter in his hand. Perhaps in this case the effort of the artist to make the offering as large as possible induced him to represent the king as holding it, of necessity, with both hands.

The third and latest of the decrees was issued in the year 16, month 2 of the third season. The text reads: "His majesty decrees to establish divine offerings for his father, Amon-Re, king of gods, upon the offering table of silver (called)¹³ Great of Food,

¹⁰ Champollion, *Not. Descr.* II, p. 58. Relief unpublished.

¹¹ See Champollion, *Mon. colxviii*; *Not. Descr.* II, p. 54. Notice the bread carried by the little figure in the form of the three hieroglyphs of the king's name, Men-maat-Re. Loaves of this same shape occur in the reliefs of Ramses II on the south side of the hypostyle hall, where they bear evidence to the usurpation by that Pharaoh of his predecessor's work.

¹² All four of these reliefs show the king resting on one knee, with the other leg extended behind him as though he had just approached the god and had sunk forward without waiting to bring both feet together, which would have been necessary in kneeling on both knees. The former position, with one leg extended behind him, is that regularly adopted in the act here represented. It is also the attitude normally assumed by the king when he approaches the god to receive jubilees and other such blessings from the deity.

¹³ I have interpreted the term "Great of Food" as the name of the table presented by the Pharaoh, though it may be merely a descriptive phrase

which the King of Upper and Lower Egypt, Ramses III, made for him." The provisions which were to be placed on the table consisted of 210 loaves of *by.t*-bread of various sizes,¹⁴ 794 loaves of *psn*-bread¹⁵ of six sizes and kinds, 4 loaves of white bread, five cakes, 5 *mh.t* of date confection, 96 jars of beer and 4 *mdj*³ of dates.¹⁶ There were also *wndw*-cattle, fowl, wine, fruit, incense, flowers and vegetables. In addition honey and fat were provided to be employed in the preparation of the cakes.¹⁷ The Pharaoh seems to have been specially proud of this gift of his to the temple for he mentions it five times on the walls of the building.¹⁸ In Papyrus Harris (V 12) he states: "I made for thee (Amon) a great offering table of silver in hammered work, mounted with fine gold, the inlay figures of *ktm*-gold, with statues of the king of gold in hammered work." The introduction to the decree reads: "His

and not a name. But names for such objects are frequently given in the records. At Medinet Habu (see *Medinet Habu*, Vol. II, Pl. 106, l. 23) mention is made of a fortress which the king erected designated "The House of Ramses-Ruler-of-Heliopolis (called) Great of Food (*wr dꜥꜣ*) for Egypt."

¹⁴ Unfortunately, in the recent publication of this inscription in *Oriental Institute Publications*, Vol. XXXV, Pl. 108, by an inexcusable oversight, three errors, corrected in Fig. 1 of this article, appear on our copy. Line 14 there gives 10 as the total of *by.t*-bread instead of 210. Line 18 shows 200 loaves of *psn*-bread instead of 500. Line 37 reads *šd* instead of *d*.

¹⁵ Of the *by.t*-bread and the *psn*-bread one item under each category is modified by the term *dp.t*. In the Medinet Habu Calendar *dp.t* never modifies either *by.t* or *psn* but occurs only in the combination *dp.t-nš*, and then but rarely, four times in all and confined entirely to the Sokar lists.

¹⁶ The totals in line 28 of the inscription give the number of loaves of bread correctly as 1008. This number covers the bread items in Lines 9 to 21 inclusive, the cakes, sweets and beer being excluded as usual from the bread totals. The total quantity of grain required for the whole list of cooked foods, lines 9 to 27 inclusive, is put at 20 sacks whereas an addition of the amount assigned to the various items of the list comes to 20 sacks and 2 *hꜥꜣ.t*. There is here an obvious miscalculation on the part of the scribe.

¹⁷ The honey came to 4 *hmw*-jars per day and the fat to 2 *hmw*-jars. In the Medinet Habu Calendar, in List 6, that for the daily offerings (ll. 282-287), the honey for cakes was set at 6 $\frac{2}{3}$ *hmo*-jars and the fat for the same purpose at 3 $\frac{1}{3}$ *hmo*-jars, the same proportion as in the Karnak list. However, the relation between the honey and the grain used in the two cases is not parallel.

¹⁸ *Reliefs and Inscriptions at Karnak*, Pls. 23 A-29, 34: 22, 94: 13, 108: 5, 6, 8, 109: 4.

majesty has decreed to establish divine offerings for his father, Amon-Re, king of gods, newly upon his great and august offering table (called) Great of Food, which remains before him every day, which the king of Upper and Lower Egypt, Usermare-Meriamon, made for him. His majesty has filled the granary of divine offerings of his father, Amon-Re, king of gods, with the grain of Egypt so that its heaps are His majesty has decreed¹⁹ to establish divine offerings newly for his father, Amon-Re, king of gods, upon the great offering table of silver (called) Great of Food, which the king of Upper and Lower Egypt, Ramses III made for him. He made it as an increase over that which was formerly, a regular daily offering." In one inscription in the temple the monarch reckons the precious metal used in the manufacture of the table at "thousands of *debn*."²⁰

Fig. 4 shows this offering table at which the king officiates, the one by which stands the little statue of the king. The accompanying inscription describes the scene as: "Offering a great oblation to (his) august father, Amon-Re, lord of Karnak, the chief one of *Ip.t-sw.t*, (consisting), of tens of thousands of beer, of fowl, a pure offering for thy Ka, (upon) thy great and august offering table (called) Great of Food, which remains before thee every day." The inlay figures of *ktm*-gold which Papyrus Harris refers to are the figures of the Nile gods which adorn the body of the table.²¹ The figures of the king of

¹⁹ In this introduction to the decrees the word *wꜥ* is used in the *sdm.n.f*-form while in the decrees themselves it appears in the *sdm.f*-form. The difference in the form is probably due to the fact that the decrees express a "prescribed act destined to occur in the future" (Gardiner, *Egyptian Grammar*, § 440: 3) which is "common in contracts, rules and the like." On the other hand the introduction is a "past narrative" (*ibid.*, § 414) referring, not to the content of the decree, to the incomplete, because continuing act carried out daily in the temple, but to the act of issuing the decree, which was already completed at the time the introduction was written.

²⁰ *Reliefs and Inscriptions at Karnak*, Vol. I, Pl. 34: 22.

²¹ On Plates 94 and 109 of our publication, *Reliefs and Inscriptions at Karnak*, this table is shown, its identity being vouched for by the text accompanying the scene. In one case the side of the table shows merely a series of Nile gods, while in the other instance cartouches of the king alternate with the Niles. Probably the artist merely relied on his memory or on sketchy description in reproducing the king's gift to Amon. On Plate 24 a similar table is depicted though it is not stated to be the one called "Great of Food."

hammered gold are the two small kneeling statues holding conical objects, either white bread or incense, which were placed at the two front corners of the table, one of which can be seen in the relief. The contents of the offering include only objects mentioned in the endowments, with the possible exception of the "twists"²² in the middle of the heap which are not mentioned in the decree.

Just as the word for *hnt*, previously discussed, is always determined in this temple by the picture of the object itself, so the word *htp*, offering table, is determined by a representation of the table with round loaves of bread upon it and leaves laid above to protect the food from dust and contamination.

It is noticeable that the source for all the supplies with which this Karnak offering table was endowed was the king's mortuary temple at Medinet Habu, "the House of Millions of Years of the King of Upper and Lower Egypt, Usermare-Meriamon, in the estate of Amon." The grain for the offerings was derived from the granary of that temple, the cattle from its herds, the wine, fruit, incense, honey and fat from its treasury and the vegetables from its gardens. The same is true of the endowments for the *hnt*-stands and the little statue of the king. Apparently the Medinet Habu temple was functioning by the year 6.

As we have seen, in the introduction to the decrees the Pharaoh gives twice over what seems to be the substance of the enactment which follows endowing the offering table. In both cases the table is called "Great of Food" but in the one case it is designated the "great and august offering table . . . which remains before him (Amon) every day," and in the other it is described as the "great offering table of silver." In both instances it is said to have been made by Ramses III. The second decree differs from the first in that it provides for an "increase over that which was formerly." The king is evidently not referring to two different tables, as they both bear the same name, but rather to two different documents. The first was probably the original edict fixing the endowment when the table was first made and presented to the temple, while the latter was issued later increasing the original endowment.²³

²² To judge from the Medinet Habu Calendar lines 117, 278, 431, 525, these "twists" are a form of sweet, the *hnyꜣy-ḥ*.t, which word is determined by an object of the same shape as those depicted in the middle portion of the offerings shown in this relief.

²³ I am indebted for this suggestion to Dr. Siegfried Schott.




FIG. 1. Three Decrees of Ramses III.

FIG. 2. The Hieroglyphic Sign for *hnt*, a "jar-stand."



FIG. 3. Jar-stands from the Tomb of Neferronpet at Thebes.




FIG. 5. Silver Statue of Seti I bearing Offerings.



FIG. 6. Herihor offering to Amon.




FIG. 4. The Great Offering Table with the Statue of the King beside it.

Possibly for this reason the scribe identifies the table as the one made of silver to distinguish it from other offering tables which had been made between the dates of the two decrees. The list of food specified in the royal rescript here given contains the revised amounts and items, including both the original endowment and the additions of the year 16. It seems very probable that the first decree, the text of which is not given in the inscription as it was superseded by that of the year 16, was issued at some time prior to the year 7 in which the little statue of the king was added to the temple furniture, for the latter stood "near the great offering table of Amon-Re, king of gods," and, if we may trust the relief shown in Fig. 4, the table near which it stood was that known as "Great of Food." This latter must therefore have been already in use when the statue was made in the year 7. The scribe who arranged the text we are discussing placed the decree of year 16 first, not only because it was the longest and had to do with the most important of the royal gifts, but also because chronologically the original decree endowing the table came first. The edict providing for the little statue would logically come next as it formed an adjunct to the offering table. The *hnt*-stand would then naturally be relegated to the last place.

These three decrees provide for only a very small portion of the gifts which Ramses III made to Amon during his reign. On the walls of his little temple he records a large variety of such gifts, some of them those mentioned in Papyrus Harris, but some not elsewhere noted. These three he seems to have singled out as of special importance. Owing to the dates of the decrees it is difficult to believe that they provide for temple furniture made for his new temple at Karnak. It is, of course, possible that the objects were removed to that temple when it was erected and the king therefore thus mentioned them especially on its walls. Until we know more than we do now of the furnishings of a temple in the Ramesside era this question must remain unsettled.

INTERTESTAMENTAL STUDIES

A. T. OLMSTEAD

ORIENTAL INSTITUTE, UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

PUBLICATION in 1913 of the *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament* under the editorship of R. H. Charles fittingly brought to a close a generation of intensive study of the intertestamental writings. New texts were discovered, old texts were adequately edited and translated, Jewish and Christian writings were ransacked to fill the notes. Until new texts are discovered, there would seem little opportunity for significant advance along these lines.

New Testament students have well utilized this material; Old Testament scholars have too often ignored it, although in these documents we have the earliest witnesses to the Biblical text, both Greek and Hebrew, and although they were contemporaries of the latest parts of the Old Testament. Historians of Greece and Rome have but occasionally dipped into them; conversely, the editors of these writings have often shown themselves curiously helpless in their handling of the classical background and of the classical sources. It goes without saying that little use has been made of the non-Jewish and non-Christian literature of the later Orient, still less of the older oriental literature; that archaeology might play a part is barely suspected.

Yet these documents have a supremely important place in the general history of the Graeco-Roman Orient. Their narrative details solve many a problem of Hellenistic and Roman history; they add many facts to the history of culture; at times they illustrate the movement toward Hellenization; more often they prove that reaction against Hellenization which is the leitmotif of our history. Before they can be safely used, we must determine according to standard historical method their date, character, and sources, and this is best secured by fitting their data into the background of the general history. During the last two years, these documents have been studied by our Seminar in Oriental History; a few gleanings may be presented as theses, since the space at our disposal does not permit full discussion.

When Democritus the philosopher made use of Babylonian

gnomic sayings and to his work "On the Sacred Writings in Babylon" added those of Akikaros translated from a tablet (stèle),¹ he probably saw it in cuneiform, for the story has a historical basis. Ahīqar, "counsellor of all Assyria and seal bearer of king Sennacherib," is Ahīqar, second officer of Barhalza, who appears in a document of 698, probably also the Ahīqar, official of Bit Sinibni, mentioned in a letter.² His nephew and adopted son, Nadin, is the scribe Nadinnu, who appears in 671 and writes letters to Esarhaddon and Ashur-baniapal.³ When Nadin accused Ahīqar to Asurhiddan,—the names of Sennacherib and Esarhaddon are written in the same essential consonants as in the Bible; Sennacherib also is found on the Aramaic ostrakon from Ashur,—the king summoned Nabu-sum-iskun, who mounted his swift horse in pursuit; he is well known as the *mukīl apāte*, "rein-holder," or cavalry commander, of Sennacherib and writer of several letters.⁴ Perhaps the disgrace of Ahīqar was connected with the harem intrigues for the throne at the close of Esarhaddon's reign when other important officials met a worse fate.⁵ The Syriac versions assumed their present form under the Parthians, who are mentioned by name, as is Akhi, son of Hamselim, king of Persia and Elam, the Parthian vassal kingdoms whose rulers left us coins of Persis and Elymais; that the stories are far earlier is proved, not only by their appearance in the Greek life of Aesop but by their cuneiform parallels, for instance the forged letter of the Assyrian king may be compared with the letters of Burnaburiash to Ikhnaton.⁶

With few exceptions, scholars are agreed that the fragments quoted by Josephus from Hecataeus of Abdera are forgeries.⁷ The most important tells us that after the battle of Gaza, 312, many Jews wished to return to Egypt with the victor, Ptolemy I, among them a chief priest Ezechias, not without (Greek) education,

¹ Clem. Alex., Strom. i. 15, 69; Euseb., Praep. Evangel., x. 4; Diog. Laert., v. 50; Strab., xvi. 2, 39, Achaikaros of Borsippa.

² C. H. W. Johns, *Assyr. Deeds and Documents*, nos. 468, 251; Leroy Waterman, *Royal Correspondence* II. 258 f.

³ Johns, *op. cit.* nos. 60; 368; Waterman, *op. cit.* I 274 f.; II 36 ff., 274.

⁴ Johns, *op. cit.* no. 253; Waterman, *op. cit.* I 296 f.; II 44 ff.

⁵ A. T. Olmstead, *History of Assyria* 386 ff.

⁶ Dr. R. A. Bowman and his Aramaic card dictionary of Aramaic have been of great aid.

⁷ Literature in Pauly-Wissowa, *Real-Encyclopädie* VII 2765 ff.

able in speaking but particularly skilled in business; all the Jewish priests who received tithes of the revenue and administer (*διοικῶν*) public affairs are about 1,500. Ezechias collected his friends and from a written memorandum read them the advantages of the suggested migration, including their settlement as *κατοίκοι*, that is, under military tenure, and their citizenship.⁸

So long as this was the only reference to Ezechias, its authenticity might be denied, but by his excavations at Beth Zur Professor Sellers has given us another witness, again contemporary, a Philisto-Arabian coin with the names of Jehohanan and Hezekiah in Hebrew.⁹ Jehohanan is Honnai or Onias I, the true high priest, Hezekiah or Ezechias is a high priest, his chief financial officer, what the Greeks called *διοκέρης*, who naturally placed his name also on the coins he minted. With this unexpected proof that Hecataeus knew more than his critics, we are constrained to accept his other statements, that Jewish soldiers were taken to Egypt by Ptolemy I, given some sort of modified citizenship, and granted lands under military tenure.

Another quotation from Hecataeus may be detected in the work of the properly named "Pseudo-Aristeas," who copies his sources literally and with the utmost stupidity. We learn that before Ptolemy I brought in Jewish soldiers and settled them up country under military tenure, he had been anticipated by the Persians and still earlier by Psammetichus who employed them against the Ethiopians.¹⁰ A generation ago, it was possible to deny these otherwise unsupported statements, the Elephantine papyri have proved the second and third, the Beth Zur coin now supports the first, it is admitted by all that later in the Ptolemaic period Jews in Alexandria had some sort of limited citizenship, later Ptolemaic papyri show Jews occupying lands under military tenure. In the light of these facts, one may demand a complete overhauling of theories which assume a good half of Greek references to Jews to be pseudonymous.

Pseudo-Jeremiah's Hebrew letter was sent to his Babylonian compatriots in warning against idolatry about the same time, perhaps under Seleucus I, for Babylonian temples have been recently

⁸ Joseph., *contra Apion.* i. 183 ff.

⁹ O. R. Sellers, *Citadel of Beth Zur* 73 f.

¹⁰ Epist. Arist. 12 f.; cf. 31 for reference to Hecataeus.

restored but the destruction of Esagila by Xerxes is still remembered. Our author shows first hand knowledge of Babylonian customs, for example, the *ishqu* or sale of the income of temple sacrifices, and adds one more instance of observing Hammurabi's admonition "that the strong should not injure the weak."¹¹

Background for Jewish apocalyptic is found, not so much in Aramaic stories of the fallen angels in First Enoch, which belong rather to the washed-out mythology better known from the Phœnician epics of the Ras Shamra tablets and Sanchuniathon, as preserved by Philo of Byblus, but in pagan sources. Most important is the so-called Demotic Chronicle, with its prophecies after the event for the history of the independent Egyptian dynasties which fought the "Mede," its oracular responses and their interpretations, its hope for a Messianic king to free the land of the "Ionians."¹² Roughly contemporary are other fragments.

Also contemporary is the Alexandra of Lycophon, which despite a contorted style and a wealth of allusions demanding constant use of a manual of classical myths, is equally apocalyptic; in Cassandra's mouth is placed the story of Aeneas and his descendants, leading up to the present and future conquests of Rome in the eastern Mediterranean, much the same tale that Virgil was to tell when those conquests were matters of proud history. Another clue to the solution of apocalyptic problems is found in the liver omens, sorted out and recopied with reference to the revolt of Molon of Media against the youthful Antiochus III, where Akkad becomes the Seleucid empire, Elam is Media, the kingdom of Molon, and ancient Guti stands for the advancing Parthians.¹³

Jeshua ben Sira was no recluse teacher of wisdom; he had played his part, not always successfully, in assembly, sanhedrin, and law court. Like Greek philosophers, he had gone on frequent embassies to Hellenistic monarchs, had been accused by rival ambassadors, Nabataean, Philistine, and Samaritan (50:25 f.), and had been in danger of his life. First he attacked the Hellenizers (41:5-13), condemned rich offerings given as bribes by oppressors such as Antiochus III,¹⁴ who after the treaty of Apamea (188) must extort

¹¹ Cf. *AJSL* 51 (1935). 247 ff.

¹² W. Spiegelberg, *Die sogenannte Demotische Chronik* 1914.

¹³ F. Thureau-Dangin, *Tablettes de Louvre* VI 1 ff.

¹⁴ Joseph., *Ant.* xii, 138 ff.

the last drachma from diminished and impoverished possessions to pay the huge indemnity to Rome, and Seleucus IV, the exactor of Daniel. God will hear the cry of the oppressed, smite the oppressor and the arrogant, dispossess the scepter of pride, cast down the staff of wickedness, and bring salvation (35: 12-19).

Let God shake his hand against the strange peoples, renew the plagues of the Exodus, subdue the foe and expel the enemy, hasten the end, ordain the appointed time, make an end of the head of the enemies' princes that says: 'There is none beside me! Gather the tribes of Jacob to receive their ancient heritage, fill Zion with majesty and the temple with the Lord's glory, establish the vision spoken in the divine name, prove the prophets trustworthy (36: 1-17). After Magnesia (190), Jeshua had seen Rome grant complete independence to half-vassal kingdoms in Asia Minor, new kings rule the two Armenias; "many down-trodden have sat on a throne, those never thought of won a crown" (11: 5). The wicked Seleucid king is compared with the wished-for Jewish monarch. Rule of the world is in the hands of God, at the right time he sets over it one worthy; sovereignty is transferred from nation to nation, witness Paneas and Magnesia, at Magnesia God smote Antiochus marvelously (9: 17-10: 5, 7-18).

Having thus awakened expectation, Jeshua introduces the hoped-for nationalistic monarch by his "Praise of Famous Men" leading up to the ruling high priest Simeon II, son of Johanan-Onias II. Civil war with Hyrcanus, pro-Ptolemaic son of the Tobiad tax collector Joseph, who was established east of the Jordan, gave Simeon excuse to build up an army against rebels from the disturbed Seleucid monarchy.¹⁵ Simeon, we learn from Jeshua's ode, fortified the temple, built the city wall with turrets like a king's palace, dug a reservoir against possible siege; he took thought against the robbers, the partisans of Hyrcanus, but also fortified the city against the enemy, the Seleucids. Jeshua's picture of Simeon's glorious appearance as he officiated in the temple, the enthusiasm of the assembled people, the closing wish for long-lived seed, all indicate that revolt was in the air (49: 15b-50: 24).

Unfortunately, Simeon's rule was very short,¹⁷ his son Onias III reversed the policy; he kept Jerusalem in unbroken peace, he enforced the laws strictly, he persuaded Seleucus IV to pay from his

¹⁵ Joseph., *Ant.* xii, 186 ff.

¹⁶ Joseph., *Ant.* xii. 225.

own revenues the whole expense of the temple sacrifices.¹⁷ Jeshua could only urge those who feared the Lord to wait patiently, for never had the Lord failed them in the past, and condemn the fearful hearts and faint hands and the sinner, Onias, who went both ways (2: 7-14). First, to our knowledge, in Hellenistic times, Jeshua preached the national king, and in revived Hebrew instead of the current Aramaic; perhaps Daniel knew him, his preaching must have influenced later nationalistic movements.

Although it has long since been published in part, Biblical students have failed to utilize an important Babylonian tablet from the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes. News of the battle of Pelusium, "King Anti'uku marched victoriously in the cities of the land of Meluhha," now identified with the Sinai region, reached Babylonia between August 19 and September 16, 169. We hear of "citizens (*puliše, politai*), who made images and works which were like the images of the Iamanu," the Ionians of the contemporary Demotic Chronicle and Daniel. The *zazak*, the diocetes or financial official, appointed by the king, gave him the gold in the treasury of Esagil for the great shrine of the god Bel, an unsuitable likeness of the god Uru-gal was dedicated, thieves stripped the images of Uru-gal and of the god called Ammani'ta, but were captured, condemned, and cast into the fire. May this British Museum tablet, so important for the understanding of Daniel, after so many years be published in full.¹⁸

Like the Jews, the Babylonians did not approve of the new "reforms." To prevent further confiscation of lands belonging to Esagil, twice before confiscated but returned by queen Laodice, her grant was again copied in 173-2 from the foundation stone of Seleucus II.¹⁹ Anu-uballit, whose second name is Kiplunu, in Greek Cephalion, son of Anu-balaṭsu-iqbi, lord of the city or as the Greeks would say, Komarch, both frequently met in contemporary business documents, rebuilt the ancient temple of Uruk for king Anti'ikusu, April 24, 169, but excavations show that the ancient plan was followed; not a trace of Hellenization appears.²⁰

¹⁷ II Macc. 3: 1 ff.

¹⁸ T. G. Pinches, *The Old Testament in the Light of the Historical Records and Legends of Assyria and Babylonia*, 2 ed. (1903), 480, 553.

¹⁹ C. F. Lehmann, *ZA* 7 (1892). 330 ff.; recovery of this tablet, formerly in the Ward collection, and republication are urgently to be desired.

²⁰ J. Jordan, *Warka* 1928. 41; 63 ff.; note the correct date! In the use of these documents, I have been aided by Dr. Waldo Dubberstein.

Nor should we forget the tablet of 163, copied in Shumerian and Akkadian, which shows the *amat Enlil*, the all powerful command of the god in its various manifestations, on its way from the ancient Shumerians to the "Word of God" of the Fourth Gospel.²¹

Daniel remains our chief contemporary source for Antiochus Epiphanes, but there are others. The author of the Hebrew First Maccabees and the epitomator of the Greek history by Jason of Cyrene lived between the death of John Hyrcanus in 105 and the coming of Pompey, 63. By this time, the Hasmonæan rule was bitterly attacked and both alike attempt a defense by telling the story of their famous ancestors with the propaganda showing clearly through, but they possessed earlier sources, and in writing.

The earliest document in First Maccabees is a magnificent lament, composed while the temple lay in ruins, 168-165. It is preserved complete, though broken into three separate fragments and listed in the wrong order. Citation in a slightly adapted form of the revised version will prove its unity:

And Jerusalem was uninhabited like a wilderness,
None of her offspring went in or out;
And the sanctuary was trodden down,
And sons of strangers dwelt in the citadel;
And joy was taken away from Jacob,
And the pipe and the harp ceased.

And they shed innocent blood on every side,
And the sanctuary they defiled;
And because of them the inhabitants of Jerusalem fled,
And she became a dwelling for strangers;
Herself estranged from her offspring,
And her children forsook her.

Her sanctuary became desolate as a wilderness,
Her feasts were turned into mourning,
Her sabbaths into shame,
Her honor into contempt;
As her glory, so was her dishonor increased,
And her high estate was turned into mourning.

²¹ G. A. Reisner, *Babylonische Hymnen* no. 1.

Her house is become as a man dishonored,
 Her glorious vessels are carried away captive;
 Her infants have been slain in the streets,
 Her young men by the enemies' sword;
 What nation hath the kingdom not possessed,
 And hath not taken the spoils?

Her adornment hath all been taken away,
 Instead of a free woman she is become a slave;
 And behold, our holy things and our beauty
 And our glory have been laid waste;
 And the heathen have profaned them,
 Why should we continue to live? ²²

Translation of this magnificent lament, five stanzas of six trimeter lines, back into the original Hebrew should not be difficult. A fragment of another lament has eight instead of six lines to the stanza.²³ The apocryphal Prayer of Azariah is still a third lament of the period. The last Words of Mattathiah, presumably an ancestor of the still more famous Chapter on Faith in Hebrews, is a somewhat later composition,²⁴ but the three-line stanza poem in praise of Judas must have been written before his death,²⁵ the ode in praise of Simon is also contemporary.²⁶

Even more significant is the quotation of a part of our canonical Psalm 79, for it is not cited as scripture, the English translator's insertion of the "psalmist" to the contrary notwithstanding, but as a similar contemporary poem.²⁷ This raises the question of the Maccabæan psalms. It is well known that the heading of Psalm 30 contains the only Biblical reference to the Hanuka, the rededication of the temple in 165; it should be observed that the original heading was "Song of the Hanuka of the House," the word "Psalm" before and the phrase "to David" after being obvious later additions. Since "Psalm, to David," is found in the Greek translation, certainly made less than a century later, the original heading must be virtually contemporary, and indeed the whole psalm does fit well with temple rededication. A renewed study of the psalm headings, with especial regard to the Antiochus references in the Peshitta, must bring valuable results.

²² I Macc. 3: 45; 1: 37-40; 2: 8-13.

²⁵ I Macc. 3: 1-9.

²³ I Macc. 1: 25-28.

²⁶ I Macc. 14: 6-15.

²⁴ I Macc. 2: 49-68.

²⁷ I Macc. 7: 17.

The curious description of the Romans, with its praise and its errors, is also contemporary. A generation later, when Hellenistic princes snapped their fingers at a supine senate, no oriental would have so described their power, two generations later the Orient knew the Romans only too well, profiteering nobles and publicans were already destroying the east.²⁸ Despite translation from Latin to Greek to Hebrew and then back to Greek, in the accompanying treaty with Judas, the formulæ of the Latin original shine through.²⁹ In general, the other documents show the same accuracy of contemporary formulæ, and, even more significant, their data can be fitted into the background of contemporary history.³⁰

Psalms 79 is quoted as a lament for the sixty leaders of the Pious who sought peace with the high priest Jakim-Alcimus and were slain.^{30a} One of these Pious wrote the epistle of Baruch, urging submission to Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, and his son Belshazzar, "Antiochus and Antiochus, his son, kings," according to contemporary Babylonian usage, while the priest at Jerusalem, Joakim, is naturally Jakim-Alcimus, and the date is not far from 162 B. C. The date A. D. 74-5 is that only of the present edition, for the dating verse has a different form in the earlier Latin version. A date in the second century B. C. is also demanded by the fact that the Hebrew Baruch was translated into Greek by the same man who translated the second half of Jeremiah and Daniel,^{30b} recently published and used by our author. Further evidence for this date is found in 2:17; the dead can give the Lord no glory, used as an argument to persuade him to hear the prayers of the righteous, for this shows that no resurrection is expected.

The author of II Maccabees frankly admits that he epitomized the five books of Jason of Cyrene but boasts of improvements. Amid his floridities and love of marvels, we may detect a more

²⁸ I Macc. 8: 1-16.

²⁹ I Macc. 8: 23-32.

³⁰ In 15: 22-24, the original was only: "And he wrote the same things to king Demetrius, Attalus, and Ariarathes"; Dr. N. C. Debevoise agrees with me that so early Roman relations with the Parthians are impossible, the remainder of the list suggests the author of I Maccabees himself. His reference to Arsaces further suggests that the date of I Maccabees was after 92, when Sulla met the Parthian ambassador. The letters to the Spartans are also doubtful.

^{30a} I Macc. 7: 13 ff.; II Macc. 14: 3 ff.; Joseph. Ant. xii. 385 ff.; xx. 235 ff.

^{30b} Cf. R. R. Harwell, *Principal Versions of Baruch*, 1915.

severe style with remarkably accurate employment of contemporary administrative terminology. The date of the original composition is obviously the date of the book's ending, after the glorious victory over Nicanor and before the death of Judas. Only a contemporary would have written so enthusiastic a peroration, certainly no one would have written in this tone after the high hopes of the author had been so dashed by the quickly following death of the hero. An author who so carefully chose his administrative terminology (perhaps Jason was himself a minor official) might be expected to utilize archival material, and the documents cited in the body of the book all appear authentic. Admittedly, the prefixed documents were added after the epitome was composed; it is the more curious that the account of the death of Epiphanes is so plausible, his intention to rob the temple of Nanaë in the guise of a dowry is significantly paralleled from classical literature.

Enoch literature had begun a little before Epiphanes with 17-19, where Greek influence is marked. A history of Israel as a history of animals, 83-90, dates shortly before the death of Judas. About the middle of the second century, older stories of the descent of the watchers were reëdited to make Enoch the hero, other Enoch sections belong about the same time.³¹ An astronomical treatise shows superficial knowledge of contemporary Greek and Babylonian text books, and quotes Yasht 13: 57f.³²

Limitations of space permit here no more than mere reference to the important group of Jewish writings, often in excellent Greek, which Eusebius has cited from Alexander Polyhistor;³³ as the earliest witnesses to the Greek translations of the Pentateuch, Kings, Chronicles, Job, they should be utilized in the next *Old Testament in Greek*. Much remains for investigation in the Jewish Sibylline oracles. Many of the briefer oracles are pagan, often exactly dated, as iii, 520-536, the Galatian invasion of Greece, or vii, 60f.; 108-113, after the destruction of Corinth. The core of oracle iii comes after 146; if it is a unit, the author lived in Egypt under Ptolemy VII. His wrath is especially directed against helpless Greece, although he condemns the contemporary Ptolemies and Seleucids;³⁴ he predicts the ruin of Babylon under Parthian

³¹ Enoch 13: 1-3; 12: 3-16: 2; 12: 4-6; 106 ff.; 65: 1-8, 9-12; 66: 20-36; Apocalypse of Weeks 93: 2-10; 91: 12-17.

³² Enoch 72-78; 79, 82.

³³ Euseb., *Praep. Evangel.* ix. 17 ff.

³⁴ Orac. Sibyl. iii, 8-45; 97-155; 162-184, 189-193; 211-294; 314-318; 381-418; 537-572; 596-651.

attacks and in the rule of terror under Himerus;⁸⁵ in contrast to the woes of the Greeks is the happiness of the Jews under Simon.⁸⁶

Third Maccabees was written in the reign of Ptolemy VII Physcon, and gives the story of the persecution of the Jews because of Jewish support to his rival Cleopatra, ascribing their salvation to miraculous aid instead of bribery of the royal mistress. This the author has cleverly transferred to the reign of Ptolemy IV Philopator, utilizing the scandalous chronicles of Ptolemy of Megalopolis. The Egyptian Apion also knew the story in this form, but added enough historical details to assist in disentangling the two strands in the narrative.⁸⁷

Like the epistle at the beginning of II Maccabees in support of the new version of the Law, Aristeeas remains pseudonymous, its chief value the stupidly copied extracts from other works. Beside Hecataeus of Abdera, there is a long passage describing Judæa and Jerusalem, borrowed from a contemporary Gentile geographer, perhaps Artemidorus of Ephesus. This was written soon after the surrender of the citadel to Simon, for the citadel was strongly guarded; its garrison of 500 had taken an oath not to admit more than five, even after orders from the garrison commander they hesitated to admit visitors, "even though we were two unarmed men." Our forger continued with a description of Egypt, until he woke up and apologized, but did not strike out the passage! Egypt prevented the natives from remaining in Alexandria over five days on pretense of lawsuits, a detail which exactly fits contemporary fear of the growing power of the natives.⁸⁸ The wise sayings of the seventy-two translators are Jewish in their present form, but are built up around a treatise, perhaps Stoic, on kinship, such as that recently discovered in Egypt.⁸⁹

Judith was composed in 134 to keep up the morale of Jews besieged by Antiochus Sidetes. At first, Nebuchadnezzar is Demetrius II, who on his second campaign reconquered Babylonia from the Parthians and, aided by the king of independent Persepolis, defeated the Parthians in Media in many battles. Arphaxad is Arsaces, Mithradates I, who after his conquest of Babylonia in 141 could count among his followers "dwellers by Tigris and Eu-

⁸⁵ Orac. Sibyl. iii. 300-313.

⁸⁶ Epist. Arist. 84-110; 112b-120.

⁸⁸ Orac. Sibyl. iii. 573-595.

⁸⁹ *Ibid.* 187 ff.

⁸⁷ Joseph., contra Apion. ii. 50 ff.

phates."⁴⁰ Ignoring the capture of Demetrius II, his brother Antiochus VII now becomes Nebuchadnezzar. Holophernes takes his name from a pretender to the Cappadocian throne, who in later years was in the service of Demetrius I, but represents Cendabæus, general of Antiochus VII, whose expedition is closely followed. Accordingly, Bethulia should be Modin, before which Simon defeated Cendabæus; the slurs against the Shechemites prevent identification of Bethulia with Shechem. The high priest Jehoiachim is of course Jehohanan or John Hyrcanus himself.

Hyrcanus led his soldiers to aid Antiochus against the Parthians; the obscure reference of Josephus permits the suspicion of treachery. Certainly a Parthian embassy visited Hyrcanus in Jerusalem.⁴¹ That there were pro-Parthian elements among the Jewish population is shown by the Greek additions to Esther, brought to Egypt in 114. The two dragons of the apocalypse are explained as Haman and Mordecai; one suspects they were originally Mithradates and Antiochus VII. Haman was a Macedonian, in very truth an alien, who conspired to transfer the Persian kingdom to the Macedonians. Esther faints when she sees Artaxerxes on the throne, clad in all his epiphany, very terrible, his face flaming in glory, like an angel of God, the "awful kingly glory" of the contemporary Yasht 10. Purim is identified with the Persian feast.

Jubilees imitated and repudiated the astronomical section of Enoch, and somewhat tepidly approved the rule of Levi. Far more enthusiastically the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs praised the Hasmonæans as descendants of Levi and reflected his campaigns. However, the sections attributed to the original author must be seriously reduced, for few books were so interpolated. Many such date from between 105 and 63, when the Hasmonæans were no longer popular. One interpolator makes Reuben say: "You will seek to be exalted above Levi's sons but God will avenge them and ye shall die an evil death." "Hearken to Levi," "he shall sacrifice for all Israel until the consummation of times as the anointed high priest of whom the Lord spoke." "Bow down

⁴⁰Details in the forthcoming *Political History of Parthia* by N. C. Debevoise; Yasht 10 in honor of Mithra dates from the conquest of Babylon by Mithradates.

⁴¹Talmud Jer., *Berakot* 48; *Nazir* 226; my attention to these references was drawn by Mr. Eleazar I. Szadzunski. Tobit 13 comes from the same period.

before his seed, for on our behalf it will die in wars visible and invisible and be among you an eternal king.”⁴² Simeon has seen in Enoch, turning the tables on the Pharisees, that they will attack Levi but be overcome.⁴³ But an opponent makes Simeon say: “Obey Levi and Judah,” “from them shall come salvation; the Lord shall raise up from Levi as it were a High Priest,” a true Zadokite in place of the usurping Hasmonæans, “and from Judah as it were a king, *he* shall save Israel.”⁴⁴ Another subtly makes Judah order love of Levi, whose priesthood is higher than his own kingdom, “unless it falleth away through sin from the Lord and is dominated by the earthly kingdom.”⁴⁵ A pietist commentator thought as little of Judah as Levi.⁴⁶ Still another urged unity of Levi and Judah.⁴⁷

Mithradates of Pontus was the cause of many oracles.⁴⁸ Joyfully the Sibyl expected Italy to destroy itself by the Social War.⁴⁹ She expected on the arrival of Mithradates in the province of Asia that Rome would repay three-fold what she had taken from Asia, then tranquil peace and the millennium would come to that land,⁵⁰ but a pro-Roman replied threatening disloyal Laodiceia with the coming Roman troops.⁵¹ Numerous brief oracles against Rhodes, Samos, Delos, and other cities probably belong to the same period.

Hitherto unrecognized because his carefully arranged stanzas have been intermixed with dull prose intended to fit his writings to the Enoch corpus, we discover a great poet who deserves a full length study to himself. A careful student of the prophets, in particular Amos, in whom he found a spiritual ancestor, and with equal poetical skill, he thundered against the evils of his day, the paganism of the higher classes which resulted in a great famine, he hoped for the happy return of a patron saint like Salome.⁵²

⁴² Test. XII Patriarchs, Reuben 6: 5-12, again interpolated, to assign sovereignty to all the tribes.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, Simeon 5: 4-8.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.* 7: 1 f.; cf. Levi 14: 1, 5-8, 15.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, Judah 21: 1-5; cf. Issachar 5: 7 f.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, Dan 5: 5-9; counter interpolation, *ibid.* 4, 10-13.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, Naphtali 5 f.; 8: 1-3; Jubilees 31: 18-20 is a similar interpolation, originally only Levi was blessed by Isaac.

⁴⁸ Poseidonius 36 (Jacoby). ⁴⁹ Orac. Sibyl. iii. 367-380.

⁵⁰ Orac. Sibyl. iii. 464-469. ⁵¹ Orac. Sibyl. iii. 470-473; cf. vii 22 f.

⁵² Enoch 94: 6-10; 95; 96: 1, 3-8c; 97: 1-4, 7-10; 98: 1-99: 2, 6-9, 11-16; 100: 7-12; 103: 5-104: 9.

Compared with this poet, the author of the so-called Psalms of Solomon is a pale imitator of past literature; but he gives much aid to the historian, for his psalms cover a long period. He begins with his conversion, psalm 16, then follow 15, 14, 3, and 6. Persecution commences with 12, 4 shows him haled into court, 5 speaks of the same famine as mentioned above, 1 the alarm at the approach of Pompey, 8:18-21 describes his welcome. In 7, he fears capture of the temple, in 13 the temple has been taken but Pompey has shown mercy though Aristobulus is to be taken to Rome. In 8-10 he continues to meditate on the terrible fate of his compatriots. Aristobulus was gone to Rome and left no successor; in 17-18:10, there appears the statement that henceforth God alone is to be king, henceforth and forever, and we find the first renewal of a true Messianic hope. Psalm 2 is after the death of Pompey, 11 is the last.

An important interpolation in Jubilees, 23:11-32, was written shortly after Pompey, "sinners of the Gentiles, without mercy or compassion, wicked and strong to do evil." There is reference to the great famine, to the class wars, defilement of the holy of holies. There is to be a millenium but as yet no personal Messiah. Also we have apparently the first use of "In those days."

It has long been recognized by Biblical scholars that the phrases "In that day, in those days," usually introduce obvious interpolations. While studying the Greek translations of the Bible, I was struck by the fact that these passages were regularly missing where we had reason to believe we possessed the earlier version; in other words, they could not be much earlier than the first century B. C. In running through the apocryphal and pseudepigraphical writings, I was again struck by the obviously interpolated character of passages beginning with these phrases, and thus their date was pushed farther and farther downward. Only in the Enoch Similitudes were these phrases an integral part of the structure, guaranteed as such by the poetical form.

Fortunately we can date the Similitudes with sufficient exactness. It is generally agreed that two works have been united, one calling the Messiah the Son of Man, the other the Elect One. One prophecy in the latter group (56:5-8), explained apocalyptically or treated as an interpolation by the critics, can be dated exactly. "In those days, the angels shall hurl themselves to the east on the Parthians and Medes," not of course the Medes of the Bible and

Herodotus but the kings of Media Atropatene, a vassal kingdom often mentioned by contemporary historians. They shall tread under foot the land of God's Elect Ones, but the city of his righteous shall be a hindrance to their horses; this is the invasion of the Parthian crown prince Pacorus in 40. Jerusalem will not be captured because the Parthians will fight as usual among themselves, brother against brother, son against father and mother. Unfortunately, his prophecy was falsified; for once there was no revolt in the Parthian royal family, no Messiah appeared from Judah, the pro-Parthians and anti-Romans surrendered the city, and Judæa was ruled by Mattathiah-Antigonius as Parthian vassal king.

The significance of this exact dating for the reëmergence of the Messianic hope can scarcely be exaggerated. After the disappointment in the Hasmonæans, a renewed Messianic hope first appears to be found in the next to the last in date of the Psalms of Solomon. The Son of Man and Elect One prophecies seem to be slightly later. By successive subtractions of interpolations in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, we isolate a group of originally independent poems of a Messianic character which are brought down to the same period.⁵³ New Testament scholars may be left to assess the significance of the fact that the Messianic hope did not return until a generation before the birth of Jesus.

Enoch literature continued along the old lines, with a generous use of "in that day," "in those days."⁵⁴ The Noah literature found a new development under the wing of Enoch.⁵⁵ The sulphur waters of our Noah author, where the fallen angels burned beneath the land, were identified by an interpolator with Callirhoe east of the Dead Sea, used by the kings, the mighty and exalted, for the healing of the body, but for punishment of the the spirit; he is thinking of the last days of Herod.⁵⁶ About our era or a little later the final editor brought together the Enoch material and wrote the introduction quoted by Jude.⁵⁷ To about the beginning of our era also belongs Fourth Maccabees, interesting for its adap-

⁵³ Test. XII Patr., Simeon 6: 2-7b; Levi 4: 14-18; Judah 21: 7-22: 2; 24: 25: 3-5; Issachar 6: 1 f.; Zebulon 9; Dan 5: 4, 8-13; Naphtali 4; 8: 1-3; Asher 7: 1-3a; Joseph 19; Benjamin 9: 1 f. (9: 3-10?).

⁵⁴ Enoch 91; 94; 97, 5 f.; 99: 3-5, 10; 100: 1-6; 101: 1-103: 4.

⁵⁵ Enoch 106 f.; 10: 1-3; 60: 1-6, 25; 65: 1-67: 3; 51: 7-10; 55: 1 f.; 69: 1; 70: 7 ff.

⁵⁶ Enoch 67: 8-13.

⁵⁷ Enoch 1-5; conclusion, 104: 10-13.

tation of Stoicism to defend the Law. From this same time came such additions to the Biblical text as "That David my servant may have a lamp always before me in Jerusalem," "for my servant David's sake," "Jerusalem, which I have chosen to place my name," "If thou wilt walk in my statutes and execute my ordinances, and keep all my commandments to walk in them, then will I establish my word with thee that I spake unto David thy father, and I will dwell among the children of Israel."⁵⁸

Lack of space will not permit me to continue the survey beyond the Christian era, when to Jewish apocrypha and pseudepigrapha are joined equally interesting Christian documents. The Sibylline Oracles, for example, not only show us Augustus and his successors as they appeared to orientals who did not always appreciate the much advertised "Roman Peace;" they add information not always utilized by historians of the Roman Empire. One illustration out of many must suffice.

All students of the Fourth Sibylline Oracle are agreed that it dates from 80-81 A. D., and they are right; thanks to recent work on Parthian numismatics, we can date it even closer. Our author expects the return of the pseudo-Nero from beyond the Euphrates, where, according to Dio Cassius, he had taken refuge with Artabanus.⁵⁹ Now Artabanus V was not a recognized Parthian monarch; he never held Iran, his coins are found at Seleucia only from August 80 to November 81,⁶⁰ and the expected return is therefore in the spring of 81.

To my knowledge, all students are agreed that the oracle is the work of a Palestinian Jew, though one makes him also a Christian Jew. Yet the work was clearly written in North Syria, at Antioch or Cyrrhus, whose doom is eagerly awaited from the nearby Parthian supported Pseudo-Nero, and it is as clearly not Jewish, the Hebrews are outsiders, but Christian. Dr. Sherman Johnson will, I hope, later discuss the reminiscences of Pauline and other New Testament writings and their importance for New Testament criticism; here I can only point out that the Fourth Sibylline Oracle is after the Epistle of Barnabas the oldest non-canonical Christian document.

⁵⁸ *AJSJL* 30, 1 ff.; 31. 169 ff.; 34. 145 ff.

⁵⁹ Dio, lxvi, 19, 3b.

⁶⁰ R. H. McDowell, *Coins from Seleucia on the Tigris* (1935). 193.

THE ELKAN ADLER PAPYRUS NO. 31

NATHANIEL JULIUS REICH
DROPSIE COLLEGE

THROUGH the good offices of Dr. Cyrus Adler, President of the Dropsie College, I was able in the summer of 1935 to study the rich collection of about seventy Demotic and Greek papyri owned by Dr. Elkan N. Adler of London.* The whole collection is to be edited by the owner; however, two fragmentary papyri were not intended for that edition, and of these the present document is one. This document is of the utmost importance because it is unique in the Demotic literature. It needs the following descriptions and interpretations.

DESCRIPTION

The papyrus consists of two fragments (see the plate) of light yellow color. It is inscribed only on the recto, the verso being blank. The lines run parallel to the fibres of the papyrus. The measurements of the larger fragment are: $6\frac{3}{4}$ by $4\frac{3}{4}$ inches; the smaller one is 6 by $2\frac{1}{4}$ inches. The beautiful script shows the flowing business-hand of the office-clerk (or perhaps the head clerk) of the hierarchic bureaucracy of the second century B. C. The ink is a good black that has faded very little, except for one or two words in lines 4 and 5.

The manuscript could be read quite easily if it were not for its fragmentary condition. It seems that the first line of the larger fragment was actually the first line of the original, judging from what remains of the first two lines, which must have contained the dating, i. e. the date according to the regnal years plus the list of the Ptolemaic rulers with their eponymous priests, as we are accustomed to see in contracts and other official documents. The bottom of the papyrus is broken off and we do not know whether more than the three scribes of lines 11-13 signed the document. On the left side of the smaller fragment nothing is missing. On the right-hand

* I wish to express my sincere thanks to both scholars for giving me this opportunity and I am especially obliged to Dr. Elkan Adler who afforded me every facility and gave me permission to publish papyrus No. 31 separately. This particular papyrus I enjoyed discussing briefly with the late Professor James Henry Breasted in Rome, during the summer of 1935. It is thus fitting to present this paper in a volume dedicated to his memory.

side of the larger piece, where the lines began, very little is missing and that little can be restored for the most part. The beginnings of lines 8-12 are complete.

The real trouble is in the middle of the manuscript, the space between the two fragments. How large this space was is mostly a matter of interpretation of the nature and contents of the document. It cannot have been much more than the present breadth of the larger fragment; in all probability, it was much less.¹ The latter view seems to be supported by a mechanical comparison of the corresponding lines of the two fragments, which fit exactly into each other, even with regard to the distances between them. I looked in vain for marks of a ruler, which surely was not used in this case. The scribe evidently loved neatness and clearness, a characteristic which is of great help in reading and interpretation.

I should add that the lines of the right half of the larger fragment do not look as horizontal as they should through no fault of our scribe. The fragment has to be moved to its left so far that its two pieces touch each other in line 4, so that the slanting line of the sign for 'n' "again," on the right part, finds its exact continuation in its other half on the left. This right part is, in the state in which it was photographed, not quite vertical (the upper part of it having a tendency to the right) because the bottom of the papyrus has shrunk a bit more than its top.


The papyrus abounds in blank spaces. Between lines 2 and 3 a whole line has been left blank; between lines 10 and 11 a space of two lines remained unused. In line 8, ending a paragraph, about two-thirds of the line have been left blank, and the scribe begins the following paragraph with line 9.

NATURE OF THE DOCUMENT AND ITS CONTENTS IN GENERAL

The preceding description was necessary because it helps us in determining the nature of this document. On first reading, one might be led to the conclusion that we are dealing here with a contract for a sale or perhaps for a lease² (in either case of some landed property), because the remainders of the first two lines clearly indicate that they contained the so-called dating which is used also in such contracts. The measurements of the landed

¹ See Commentary, especially on lines 3 and 4, 7 and 9.

² This latter view seems to be supported especially by the first word of line 10: *shn* "lease."



The Elkan Adler Papyrus No. 31.

property follow. It is described as a "plot of land," "unbuilt on ground," among the *ψυλοὶ τόποι* somewhere³ in the western district of Thebes, and this description leads us to the same assumption, especially as also here are enumerated its "neighbors," i. e. the adjacent areas, with a final summation in the customary phrase: "Such are the adjacent areas of . . . , all of it." And even the name of the scribe concluding such contracts is not missing, he seems to sign in line 9; just as it looks as if the witnesses, usual in such documents, are here, too, represented in lines 11 and fol.

On the other hand we look in vain for the formulæ by which one party safeguards the other against damage, etc. Moreover, we notice that there is not even a second party mentioned.⁴ Also such blank spaces as occur frequently in the text⁵ of our document are never found in actual contracts, which run from the beginning of the dating to the very end which lists the scribe and his titles, without any interruption of the lines and words and paragraphs of the whole text.⁶ Furthermore, if the end of a line does not offer sufficient space for the scribe to write the word in it, and he has to go over to the next line, the empty space is sometimes filled with a small horizontal line.⁷

³ This must have been described partly in the piece missing between the two fragments, twice: line 4 and line 9. The beginnings and the ends of this description, still preserved in the mentioned lines, allow us to locate this piece of real estate at least in general somewhere "in the necropolis of Zeme," the western part of Thebes, i. e. *ἐν τοῖς Μεμροελοῖς* as the contemporary Greek papyri would say.

⁴ There never was any other party in this document, not even in the lost piece of the papyrus, as can clearly be seen from the remainder of the text preserved in the two fragments.

⁵ Not only the above-mentioned spaces between the lines 2-3, 10-11, the greater part of line 8, but also within the context itself, e. g., in line 8 between the words *tr-w* and *mh-f*, line 10 between *4.t* and *h-sp*; also smaller empty spaces between each direction of the "neighbors" in lines 5-7, before their summing up in line 7, etc.

⁶ The reason of this *horror vacui* of the scribes, the "notaries" in other, actual, contracts, is in all probability to safeguard the parties against forgeries or alterations in the lacunae.

⁷ This horizontal line, which looks like a Demotic *n*, is sometimes so read erroneously. In these cases this small horizontal line does not represent a real *n*, but is obviously intended by the scribe to avoid an unused empty space which could be misused by unauthorized persons to alter or even nullify the very purpose of the document.

On account of these and other considerations of minor importance this text cannot represent a contract between two private parties. For a while I thought that I saw in it part of an official register of landed property. However, on second thought, such a list would not waste so much empty space, nor would there be any need of the signatures at the bottom. In such a list there would be only one dating for all the parties concerned who deal with that particular office; but here we have only one person. There were no other parties; this can be said with certainty, for the signatures of the other scribes in lines 11-13—with the great space left before them—prevent any assumption that our text is part of a continuous official register of landed property.⁸ Such registers have long lists of owners and their properties.⁹ It is, therefore, quite clear that our two fragments represent not a part of an official list or register of some sort, but constituted one single document by itself.

It was drawn up either to be handed over to Panas, son of Espmetis (l. 3), as a legal instrument, or to be a report to some other official about the matter.¹⁰ The possibility must not be left out of sight, either, that it may be an official document written by a higher official to a lower (or vice versa) in the same bureau, i. e. it might be an order or a report.¹¹

DATE OF THE DOCUMENT

The date of this papyrus offers another difficulty. The script, to be sure, points to the second century B. C. The document contains three dates. One in the first line of the dating, the other two in line 10. The date in the first line is preserved only in part; year and month are lost, also the first part of the day of the month is damaged, but part of the season is preserved. The second date, i. e. the first of line 10, is clearly written, but only the year is given. Almost immediately after it in the same line follows the third date in full: "Year 4 month 4 of the summer-season,¹² the 22nd day,"¹³ but of which king?

⁸ Or any other type of official list.

⁹ Or eventual obligations respectively.

¹⁰ In the latter case the actual facts may represent an extract from an official list or register for the special purpose just outlined. I say an extract from a list, but, as said above, not a list or register itself, our document being a separate and independent piece.

¹¹ See below, Commentary.

¹² = month Mesore.

¹³ Some of the figures for the dates of the day (which are written differ-

If we knew the king, the papyrus could be dated accurately. The meager remains of the first two lines (which once contained the name of the ruler in whose lifetime the document had been written) do not preserve the name, only the title "Pharaoh" can still be read. The papyrus was not dated with the first name,¹⁴ say of Cleopatra III, for it is here clearly a masculine person referred to, i. e. the date, as far as preserved, is only relative (year 4), not absolute. The date of the day is so far preserved that the unit is an "eight"; with the other figure (whose decisive upper part is broken off) it could yield only 18 or 28. As the figures of the day of the date are written alike, one would be inclined to read the date, discussed above, as 22nd¹⁵ and the other¹⁶ also as the 22nd, or else both of them as 28th.¹⁷ In a regular contract we would have to assume this, for there we know that these dates usually agree. But here the situation is different, also such "assimilation" of the two dates of the day is unlikely because the scribe's exactness¹⁸ would forbid this assumption. Close examination of the group which goes to the very edge of the fragment proves that it represents the same season as did the date below. However, the month of the season is lost in the first line, a matter which gives us the choice among the last four months of the year. The year is not preserved in the first line, but as the date of the tenth line is Mesore, the very last month of the year, we may with the greatest probability assume on the internal evidence of the contents of the papyrus that it was the same year. We would, then, have to go back to the preceding year, i. e. nearly 12 months, and it is hardly

ently from the figures for the cardinal numerals) still occasionally cause difficulty. The 20 here is sure, but the unit is only probable, not quite certain; though very improbable here, it could be a seven, i. e. the 27th.

¹⁴ There may have been names of two Pharaohs.

¹⁵ In line 10.

¹⁶ In line 1.

¹⁷ In this case we should have to assume that one of these dates is badly written by the scribe.

¹⁸ Or, maybe, scribes; the latter view is not quite impossible. This point, I admit, would weaken the statement in discussion. It could be argued that the whole dating of the first two lines may have been written by another scribe altogether, as this did sometimes happen in such mechanically prepared datings of contracts; and this objection must be taken into consideration; but the remains of these first two lines show a striking likeness with the other part of the document (of course, with the exception of the signatures of lines 11-13).

probable that a document of this type would be prepared one whole year ahead.¹⁹

To which king does this year "four" apply? If we knew, we should know also the absolute date of this papyrus. The low number of the regnal year in our papyrus could fit almost any of the Ptolemies.

If our manuscript were a contract,²⁰ the name of the scribe would indicate at least the approximate date, since the dates of such scribes are known to us in most cases. The present scribe, Zminis son of Espmetis, is not mentioned as a functionary, i. e. a "notary" of a contract, in any of the documents known to me; he signs his name for other reasons, as will be seen below. Also the name of the other person, Panas son of Espmetis (line 3),²¹ does not aid us much.

However, help seems to come from another quarter. The first two lines of the dating, in spite of the very little the fragment has left us of them, seem to me to yield us more by inference than they actually tell us in words. The first line has been discussed as it bears upon the remainder of the date; the only other words "of Pharaoh" tell us nothing of importance. The second line leaves us only the determinative of a word which is lost, followed by "the god who loves his mother"; then, there is another break, and the second half of the same fragment, on the very top of its portion of the document, has a short horizontal line which is the bottom part of a Demotic sign. The other fragment has nothing of this line. Perhaps more of the upper portion of the papyrus is lost.²²

¹⁹ Of course, it could even be argued theoretically that the dating of the first line may have contained the following year, five, by assuming that this document was prepared in advance in order to give it out for the "customer"—in our case the "lessee"—with the beginning of the following year; for the Egyptian New Year, according to the actual date of its drawing up, was only 8, or 13 days respectively, ahead (depending upon how we want to count the five leap days of the *ἡμέραι ἐπαγόμεναι* for business purposes, which—as a matter of fact—did not belong to the last nor to the following year; they were "above" the year according to Egyptian theory). However, I do not know of any such procedure in our whole literature.

²⁰ Which it is not, as shown above.

²¹ That the fathers of both persons in this document have the same name Espmetis (a quite common name in and around this period) is probably of no special significance to this problem. It would be of interest, however, if it could be proved that the persons were related.

²² It is possible that the script of the second line ended sooner, i. e. about

This second line consists, then, of the end (determinative) of a word plus the *p ntr mr mw-i-f* "the god loving his mother," an epithet usually applied to one of those Ptolemies with the surname *Φιλομήτωρ* in the Greek papyri; it could be Ptolemy VI Philometor, or Ptolemy IX (Philometor II) Soter II, or his younger brother, Ptolemy X (Philometor III) Alexander I.²³

Immediately preceding this "Philometor" of our text, there is preserved only the determinative of the "man with hand to his mouth."²⁴ Among the epithets of the Ptolemies this fits only for the *n ntr.w mnḥ.w* "the beneficent gods," i. e. the *Θεοὶ Εὐεργέται*. Therefore, we must look for a "Philometor" who is preceded *immediately* by an Euergetes. This rules out Ptolemy VI at once.²⁵ Furthermore, the Philometor in our papyrus is mentioned plainly in the singular: *p ntr* which was the case only for a very short time. For the preceding *mnḥ(.w)*, it is true that there is no plural sign (which I have substituted in this case) which consists only of a vertical stroke (missing here); however, such a shortening is not unusual.²⁶ But the singular *p ntr*, etc. is not such a "shortening"; it is a full word.

Keeping also in mind that we are dealing in this dating, in all

the middle of the papyrus, and that therefore no traces of script appear on the top of the smaller fragment; in other words this paragraph ended somewhere in the middle of the second line.

²³ The chronology of the later Ptolemies is a little confused in Bevan's excellent *History of Egypt under the Ptolemaic Dynasty*, and in the other works dealing with that period like those of Mahaffy, Preisigke, and others, especially with regard to the numbering of the ruling Ptolemies. In our special case I mean Ptolemy IX Soter II the Ptolemy who is numbered VIII in Mahaffy, while Ptolemy X Alexander I is numbered IX in his work. I follow in this the convincing conclusions of Walter Otto's *Zur Geschichte des 6. Ptolemäers*.

²⁴ Of Gardiner's List: A2.

²⁵ Also for some other minor reasons. These two titles in this combination do not occur at so late a date because after about 100 B. C. the scribes shorten or omit entirely the tedious lists of the deified Ptolemies.

²⁶ E. g. Pap. British Museum 10575, l. 1; British Mus. 10591, l. 3, etc.; ed. Thompson, *Family Archives from Siut*, pp. 3, 38, etc., pls. I and XVII respectively. From our scribe with his abbreviated office style it ought to be rather expected that he would drop all unnecessary endings. It has to be noted, however, that the singular *p ntr mnḥ* also occurs around this period, e. g. Rylands XXV B 2; here an intended singular(!), while in the very same papyrus, in the preceding line 1, the abbreviation *n ntr.w mnḥ* is written and meant for *mnḥ.w* as in the Papyrus Elkan Adler 31.

probability, with the part of a list of only the deified Ptolemies who had their eponymous priests,²⁷ we must recall that even Euergetes II himself is sometimes called Philometor. I assume that the sequence "Euergetes-Philometor" probably fits best Ptolemy IX Soter II. In this case the papyrus would be of the fourth year of his rule and of about B. C. 113.

Taking into consideration that the dates of the day of the month of the first line (which is partly destroyed) and of the tenth line (the 22nd of Mesore) cannot be far apart, and assuming that the date of line 1 cannot well be later than that of line 10, there is not much to choose, in my opinion, between the 18th and 28th of Mesore.²⁸

Although only the name of the season is preserved, which would leave us a choice among the 4 last months of the year, it seems reasonable to take the same month, Mesore, as in the preserved date (of line 10), because judging from the internal evidence that Panas had paid the rent fully (l. 8) and that our document has been drawn up in consequence of it,²⁹ it is perhaps quite logical to assume that this manuscript was written immediately on receipt of his payment. If so, then the date in the first two lines would be the 18th of Mesore of the regnal year four of Ptolemy IX Soter II.³⁰ This would bring us to the third of September of the year 113 B. C. for the date of the dating of the first two lines. The date of line 10 would be accordingly the 7th of September of 113 B. C., i. e. the date when the document was actually finished.

THE PERSONALITIES

There are only two persons mentioned in our papyrus apart from two fully and one partly preserved names of the "scribes" who signed the document. These three last-mentioned names are too

²⁷ Which is not always quite the same, since some were deified only after their death, while others assumed the *θεός*-title in their life-time (see Otto, *op. cit.*, pp. 14, 16). The official order interchanges a bit later on also, according to the date of their death.

²⁸ See discussion above about the possibility of reading the figure as 10 or 20, because the upper part of it is lost.

²⁹ It might even be the receipt for his payment (l. 8).

³⁰ In regard to the dating of the first two lines, the little horizontal line on the top edge (= l. 2) of the left part of the larger fragment is hardly anything else than the lower part of the Demotic *t* of the word *P-Sotr* "the Soter" which we must expect after the title "Philometor."

common to enable us to draw conclusions regarding them, while the names of the "neighbors" are too fragmentarily preserved to be of real use for identification with persons in other papyri. However, the two main persons of this document also, namely Panas son of Espmetis (l. 3) and Zminis son of Espmetis (l. 9) cannot well be placed in the Demotic literature. True, the first one appears in Pap. British Museum 1202 (of the Dep. of MSS),³¹ which is of the year B. C. 159, and also in two other papyri, unpublished, of the year B. C. 175 and 160.³² But this surely is another person³³ as he lived nearly two generations earlier than our man.³⁴

Preceding the name of the man in our papyrus is the last half of a group; the other half is missing because the papyrus is broken off there. The reading of the preserved half is *-mw* "water," and there is little doubt that it contains the title or occupation of Panas. If this be correct, then we are probably dealing with the well known *wh-mw* "water-pourer," the Greek *χοαχύτης*. These *χοαχύται* were attached to tombs and cemeteries, and were at the same time usually *παστοφόροι* (shrine-bearers) of gods of the neigh-

³¹ See vol. III of the Greek Papyri in the British Museum, ed. by Kenyon and Bell, l. c.; the Demotic part of Pap. British Museum 1202 is published by Spiegelberg in *Recueil de travaux* 31 (1909). 96 fol.

³² I am under special obligation to my friend and teacher Sir Herbert Thompson who kindly drew my attention to this.

³³ As also Sir Herbert believes. I also concur in his opinion that the names of father and son are both too common to enable us to draw conclusions from their occurrence.

³⁴ These two generations earlier would again bring us to the rule of the earlier Philometor (VI). Again I want to caution against ascribing our papyrus to his reign. If Philometor VI were meant in the Papyrus Adler, we should expect another determinative preceding *p ntr mr mw.t-f* (Φιλαμήτωρ) than the clearly written "man with hand to his mouth" and this latter determinative is never used for *nt pr.w* (Ἐπιφανής) which we properly have to expect preceding Philometor. If it were not for this objection, we could so date our papyrus (in this case its date would be around B. C. 177) and our man. But I do not see how the above objections can be removed. Otherwise, even the year 4 of the regnal year would fit excellently into the historical facts brought out in the meantime, for the singular (Philometor VI without consort) would be a new proof of his marriage not before his sixth regnal year. It could also be used for a *terminus ante quem* for the date of the death of earlier Cleopatra who had joined with him in the rule before that date; see Otto, *op. cit.*, pp. 14 and 26; Spiegelberg, *Demotische Papyri* Loeb, p. 108 fol. However, our papyrus is of the more recent date as has been brought out above.

boring temples. Those attached to tombs derived their emoluments from lands left for the purpose, and apparently from perquisites and offerings.⁸⁵ The papyrus here actually deals with such "places" or "tombs"; *m'* as a general term is "place" τόπος in opposition to the larger *ἡμῃ* "village" κώμη, and the still larger *tš* "district" νομός;⁸⁶ as a term applied here, however, it means especially a "tomb." That the whole scene in this papyrus is "the necropolis of Zeme" (in the western part of Thebes), ἐν τοῖς Μεμνοπόλεϊς of the Greek papyri, the papyrus states in lines 4 and 9. The names following each *m'* (in the description of the "neighbors" in all directions of the "plot") are the names of the dead persons who occupy these tombs, i. e. the mummies buried there. The *χοαχῦται* were clean; they dealt only with the bodies after they had been embalmed, which process made the "unclean" corpse not only "clean" but even divine, while the *παπαχῦται*, who treated the corpses before the process of embalming, were regarded as unclean and were not permitted to live in the eastern part of Thebes, the city of the living ones.⁸⁷

The *wrh* "unbuilt-on ground," "open space," contains these graves which were sold or rented to these priests with the right to care for the "places" and their mummies, physically and religiously, by services, sacrifices, etc. connected with them, and they derived, for doing this work, an income from the endowment which these people (or their relatives) had left to the temple-estate for that purpose.⁸⁸

The other main person in this papyrus, mentioned in line 9, is the scribe Zminis son of Espmetis. He is unknown to me in literature. However, it should be made plain that he is not a scribe who draws up contracts. Everybody in Egypt who was an officer in

⁸⁵ Cf. Griffith, *Rylands Papyri III*, p. 16; Wilcken, *UPZ*, p. 39.

⁸⁶ See e. g. Thompson, *Siut* 124, 343, 350.

⁸⁷ See also Kees, *Aegypten*, p. 261 f.

⁸⁸ Such a "lease," in that case for 99 years, Pemaus makes out to Panufer in 288/7 B. C. for a Choachiteship in Papyrus British Museum 10240, ed. by Reich, *Papyri jurist. Inhalts in hierat. u. demot. Schrift a. d. British Museum*, p. 56 fol. and pls. 17 and 18. It cannot quite be left out of consideration that *wh-mw* here may not mean Choachite itself but the "occupation of a Choachite," a "Choachiteship." The words would be written alike, see again Reich, *op. cit.*, Papyrus Brit. Mus. 10240, II. II 3 and V 4. This would not influence in any way our conclusions in this matter.

some administrative department (governmental, religious, or private) was a "scribe," one might say a "secretary."

His full title as far as preserved is "Who is in charge of the plots of Thebes of the cemetery (necropolis) of Zeme." Whether he was a governmental or priestly official is not known, but in line 8 it is said that Panas, i. e. the lessee, "has paid in full (and) has delivered (the rent) to the temple-estate," a statement which might lead us to believe that Zminis was a temple-official after all, perhaps one of the *sh.w n h.t-ntr*, Greek *οἱ τοῦ ἱεροῦ γραμματεῖς* "scribes of the temple-estate" as mentioned, e. g. in the inscription of Canopus.³⁹ But this conclusion is not quite binding because Zminis could be a governmental official as well, in spite of the above-mentioned facts; he may have been in charge of the plots of the district or some part of the city, or even only a smaller place in this part, and this leaflet, of which we have now these two fragments, may represent an extract from the temple lists about Panas for reasons of taxation or the like. This possibility must be left open, as must also be the question whether, in the latter case, Zminis was a *καμογραμματεὺς* or a *τοπογραμματεὺς*. But we perhaps do not need to go so far as this. As scribe of the temple his duties could have been administrative, as e. g. those of Peteêse in Rylands papyrus IX, col. I, l. 9.⁴⁰ I, personally, am more in favor of this latter assumption. These temple-scribes used to report about the arrears and other matters of the temple to the practor, *πράκτωρ*, as in the Demotic papyri from Elephantine 1, 2, 3, 4, 7 and 8.⁴¹

TRANSLITERATION OF THE PAPYRUS

- (1.) [*h-sp 4 'bt4*] *šm ss 28 n Pr-'o '.w.s.* [.....]
- (2.) [*n ntr.w mnḥ(.w)*] *p ntr mr mw.t-f [P-Sw]t[r.....]*
- (3.) [.....]-*mw Pa-n' sy Ns-p-mt swt mḥ['tn]10 a*
- (4.) [*mḥ*] *ḥte 1000 a mḥ 'tn 10 'n ḥn n wrḥ[.w Ne]ḥs(.t)Zm'*
- (5.) [*ne-*] *w ḥyn.w rs p m' [n P-]wḥr ḥn' [... sy ...]-p'*
- (6.) [*mḥt*] *p m' n P-ṭe [... sy] P-a.ṭe-ḥky' [.....] ybt*

³⁹ Version Kom el Hisn, line 20. Not to be confused with the well-known *leporγραμματεὺς* as the latter title corresponds to the Egyptian *sh pr-'nh*, Rosetta Stone, line 4.

⁴⁰ Where Griffith, *op. cit.*, p. 66, n. 3, adds that his holding with the president (the *lesonis*) against the sacerdotal staff might be intelligible enough on that ground alone.

⁴¹ See Sethe, *Bürgsch.*, p. 359.

- (7.) [p] m' n n gme.w ['mnt] p tw 'tmt' n hyn.[w n] p mh 'tn
 (8.) 10 nt hry tr-w mh-f swt.w a h.t-ntr
 (9.) sh Ns-Mn sy Ns-p-mt n[t] hr n wrh.w Ne [h]s(.t) Zm'
 (10.) shn.t-f hr h-sp 4.t sh h-sp 4 'bt 4 sm ss 22
 (11.) (other hand) sh Hr-p-R' sy 'Ns-1Hr-p-hrt
 (12.) (third hand) sh Pa-Mnt sy P-sr-Mnt
 (13.) (fourth hand) [...]-[Thwt] sy 'Hr-1-[.....]

TRANSLATION

- (1.) [Year 4 (month)] 'Mesore' the 28th day of Pharaoh l. p. h.
 [...].
 (2.) [of the beneficent god(s),] the god who loves his mother
 [the So]t[er]
 (3.) [the] water[-'pourer'] Panas son of Espmetis. Delivery
 (of payment in corn) [of] 10 [cubits of land], i. e.
 (4.) 1000 cubits of area, i. e. 10 cubits of land again among the
 grounds of Thebes of the desert (necropolis) of Zeme.
 (5.) [Their] neighbors (adjoining plots) are: South, the place
 of [... son of Pe-]uhor and [.... son of ...]-p';
 (6.) [North, the place of 'Pte] [....] 'Pateki' [....];
 East,
 (7.) the place of the gme.w (plural); [West,] the hill. Such
 are the adjacent areas [... of] the cubits of land (meas-
 uring)
 (8.) ten as (mentioned) above, all of them. He has fulfilled
 (payment and) their delivery to the temple-estate.
 (9.) Written by Zminis son of Espmetis who is in charge of the
 plots (in) Thebes [of the] necropolis of Zeme.
 (10.) It was let on lease (to him) for the year four. Written in
 the year four, Mesore 22nd.
 (11.) Scribe Harpres son of 'Es]harpekhrt.
 (12.) Scribe Pamonthes son of Psemmonthes.
 (13.) [...]-[Thot] son of 'Har-1-[....]

COMMENTARY

Line 1. As we have the beginnings of lines 8-10, an imaginary vertical line to the top would give us the space left open for the beginning of this first line. There could not be space for anything more than my restoration, namely the date, in this place.

Line 3. The first preserved group in this line is *-mw* "water"; this group for *mw* could also be taken for a determinative as well, of "channel" for instance. However, it is quite clear—apart from other considerations—that here, out in the desert, there is no channel or the like. What we may expect is a title for the following person and in this case it can hardly be anything else than the word for choachyte, as explained above. The other possibility is that the text here was "entitled" by the word "choachyte-ship," accidentally written exactly like the word for choachyte in Demotic, i. e. the text could have begun with something like this: "About the choachyte-ship of . . .," etc., or "Document about the choachyte-ship of . . .," etc., i. e. *sh wh-mw* . . ., or *sh bk wh-mw* (as in the Elephantine papyri);⁴² for more, there is hardly left sufficient space at the beginning of this line.

I must admit that if it were not for the elaborate description of the plots in this document, the paragraphs, the comparatively many signatures, etc., I would be inclined, after all, to see in this document a plain receipt for payment of the rent to the temple-estate. This view would require the minimum of interpretation, not even a specially supplied beginning of the third line *sh bk*, or the like, as not much space is left for all this.

The following names in this line do not offer any difficulty. *Pa-n'* is Greek Πανῆς, and the Demotic *Ns-p-mt* "E(n)spmetis" is the Greek Ἐσπμετῆς.⁴³

The next word seems to have been corrected by the scribe. He seems to have intended to write *shn* "(to) lease (out)," or the substantive for it. Compare the writing of this word at the beginning of line 10, where after the *s* follows the sign of the flower, but, while writing, he changed his mind and wrote *swt* "delivery (usually applied to 'corn')." Or, he might have intended to write *swn* "price" which word also has a little sign after the *s*.

Line 4. The location of the "plots" has been discussed above.

Line 6. The word *P-a.ṭe-ky* "Pateki" can, perhaps, be explained as a badly written *P-gš* "The Ethiopian."

Line 7. I do not know what the *gme.w* are; the word is perhaps a plural, of which the singular *p gm* occurs in the *Papyri New*

⁴² Nos. 1, line 2; 2, line 1 (ed. Spiegelberg), and others.

⁴³ Preisigke, *Namenbuch*, 265, s. v., and 109, s. v.

York Historical Society 373 and 388.⁴⁴ If the *n gme.w* in Papyrus Adler really are the same as the *p gm* in the Papyri NYHS, the *p gm* cannot be a proper name,⁴⁵ but must be an appellative noun, because the one occurs in Memphis and the other in Thebes. It may mean some place common to every cemetery.

Line 8. The sign ending after *swt* is not an *-f* (what is left of it is too vertical) but a plural *-w*.



⁴⁴ See Reich, "New Documents from the Serapeum of Memphis," in *Misraim* I, p. 9 fol.

⁴⁵ See my notes on this word, *op. cit.*, p. 83 f.

HEBREW *'argāz*, A PHILISTINE WORD

E. SAPIR

YALE UNIVERSITY

THE HEBREW word *'argāz* (or *'argāz*), translated as "box, chest, casket," also as "sack" or other type of "receptacle," occurs only three times in the Old Testament, and at that in a single context: I Sam. 6: 8, 11, 15. The King James Version reads:

8. And take the ark of the Lord, and lay it upon the cart; and put the jewels of gold, which ye return him for a trespass offering, in a coffer by the side thereof; and send it away, that it may go. 9. And see, if it goeth up by the way of his own coast to Beth-shemesh, then he hath done us this great evil; but if not, then we shall know that it is not his hand that smote us; it was a chance that happened to us. 10. And the men did so; and took two milch kine, and tied them to the cart, and shut up their calves at home: 11. And they laid the ark of the Lord upon the cart, and the coffer with the mice of gold and the images of their emorods (hemorrhoids). 12. And the kine took the straight way to the way of Beth-shemesh, and went along the highway, lowing as they went, and turned not aside to the right hand or to the left; and the lords of the Philistines went after them unto the border of Beth-shemesh. 13. And they of Beth-shemesh were reaping their wheat harvest in the valley: and they lifted up their eyes, and saw the ark, and rejoiced to see it. 14. And the cart came into the field of Joshua, a Beth-shemite, and stood there, where there was a great stone: and they clave the wood of the cart, and offered the kine a burnt offering unto the Lord. 15. And the Levites took down the ark of the Lord, and the coffer that was with it, wherein the jewels of gold were, and put them on the great stone: and the men of Beth-shemesh offered burnt offerings and sacrificed sacrifices the same day unto the Lord.

The word *'argāz* (*'argāz*) is obviously not the normal Hebrew word for "box" or "chest," which is rather *tēbā* or *'arōn*. The fact that it occurs only in the quoted passage, in which it may be supposed to refer specifically to a peculiar Philistine object, raises a strong presumption in favor of the theory that it is a culture word borrowed from Philistine. It would, in other words, belong to the same small group of Philistine loan words in Hebrew of which *sārānīm* "lords (of the five federate Philistine towns)" is the clearest example.¹ Attempts to explain *'argāz* as a derivative

¹ After I had framed my own theory of Philistine origin, I found the following in Henry Preserved Smith, *A Critical and Exegetical Com-*

of a Semitic root *rgz* are not to be taken seriously. The well-known Semitic verb **ragaza* "to become excited, to rage," of which there are reflexes in Hebrew, Phœnician, Aramaic, and Arabic, cannot possibly be connected with 'argāz, though Gesenius-Buhl does in fact list it as one of the derivatives of the Hebrew verb *rāgāz*. Nor is light to be derived from the 'a- of the first syllable. Whether it is called a prothetic element, as by Bauer-Leander² and Gray³ and doubtfully by Brockelmann,⁴ or a formative prefix, as by Barth,⁵ is irrelevant to its interpretation, for no phonetic reason can be given for vocalic prothesis nor can its 'a- be assigned to any known morphological type (such as Arabic "elatives" of type 'aqtal-u or such color terms and terms for bodily and mental defects as Arabic 'ahmaru "red," 'a'waru "blind," Hebrew 'akzāb "untruthful"). It is, then, an entirely isolated formation, hence further suspect of being a loanword. Syriac 'argāztā "wallet, chest" (variants *rgāztā*, *rgōztā*, *rgāstā*)⁶ looks like a cognate of Hebrew 'argāz but can hardly be more than a slightly made over Syriac form in fem. -t-ā based on a borrowed *'argāz—borrowed, moreover, not from the earlier Hebrew with unlengthened stressed vowel, 'argāz, also occurring as a variant reading for 'argāz, but from the later Hebrew with its secondary tone-lengthening. The Aramaic 'argaz quoted by Ges.-Buhl is not given in the Aramaic lexica⁷ and is no doubt to be understood as 'argāz in Rabbinical

mentary on the Books of Samuel, 1898, p. 45: "Bochart makes it a Philistine word, *Hierozycon*, II. 36."

² *Historische Grammatik der hebräischen Sprache* I. 487.

³ L. H. Gray, *Introduction to Semitic Comparative Linguistics*, § 52. Gray enters the example as: "'argāz 'coffer': Arab. *riḡāzat-un*," thereby implying an identity, or similarity, of meaning between the Hebrew and the Arabic words. But not only do the words differ in structure (type 'aqtal-u: type qitāl-at-u); there is also no reasonable way of connecting their meanings, for Arabic *riḡāzat-un* means not "box" but "counterpoise," literally and metaphorically (cf. Modern Arab. *riḡāze* "Ausgleichgewicht, Sänfte" in A. Wahrmond, *Handwörterbuch der neu-arabischen und deutschen Sprache* I. 1, 1898, p. 738).

⁴ *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der semitischen Sprachen* I. 215.

⁵ *Die Nominalbildung in den semitischen Sprachen*, § 151 d.

⁶ See, e. g., Ges.-Buhl sub 'argāz; Barth, *loc. cit.*; Brockelmann, *loc. cit.*; *Lexicon Syriacum* sub *regez*.

⁷ I do not find it in M. Jastrow, *A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature*; nor in J. Levy, *Chaldäisches Wörterbuch über die Targumim*.

literature, even when it occurs in Aramaic passages, a New Hebrew continuation of the Biblical Hebrew form.⁸ It is significant that the Targum (Aramaic translation) of the passages quoted above renders the Hebrew *'argāz* not by this pseudo-Aramaic *'argaz* but by *tēbūtā*, the Aramaic correspondent of the Hebrew *tēbā*. There is, therefore, no correspondence between Syriac and Jewish Aramaic usage, whence it seems fair to conclude that we cannot, on the basis of the Syriac and Rabbinical forms, reconstruct a genuine old Aramaic cognate of the Hebrew word; we have in Aramaic only direct or indirect borrowings from Biblical Hebrew. This again points to a presumably non-Semitic word.

Context, limited occurrence in Biblical Hebrew, singularity of form, and lack of genuine Semitic cognates conspire to make it exceedingly likely that *'argāz* is a Philistine loanword. Can we go further and give its precise meaning at the time that it was borrowed? And can we suggest an etymology on the basis of the presumable Philistine form of the word? I believe that both of these things are possible and that we can, incidentally, do a little to help fix the linguistic position of Philistine.

As to the problem of meaning, it seems clear that the term, once borrowed and felt to be a genuine Hebrew word, gradually extended its range. It came to mean any sort of "box" or "chest," could be applied to a "casket," and perhaps even developed the meaning of "bag, wallet." What did it mean in Philistine? We must examine the Hebrew text to answer this question. The three Hebrew passages in which the word occurs are as follows:

8. *ūl'qah'tēm 'et-'arōn yahwē ūn'tattēm 'ōtō 'el-hā'gālā w'ēt k'elē hazzāhāb 'āšer hāšēbōtēm lō 'āšām tāšimū bā-'argāz miššiddō w'sillahtēm 'ōtō w'hālālū* "And ye shall take the ark of Yahweh and ye shall put (lit., give) it to (emend to 'al "on"?) the cart, and the objects of gold which ye have brought back (= paid) to him (for) a guilt-offering ye shall set in the box, at its side, and ye shall send it away and it shall go."

11. *wayyāšimū 'arōn yahwē 'el-hā'gālā w'ēt hā'argāz w'ēt 'akbērē hazzāhāb w'ēt šalmē t'ḥōrēhēm* "And they set the ark of Yahweh to (upon) the cart, and the box and the mice of gold and the images of their hemorrhoids."

15. *w'hālwayim hōrādū 'et-'arōn yahwē w'et-hā'argāz 'āšer-ittō 'āšer-bō k'elē-zāhāb wayyāšimū 'el-hā'ēben ḥaggēdōlā w'anšē b'ēt-*

⁸ See Jastrow, *op. cit.*, p. 115; A. Kohut, *Plepus Aruch* I. 271.

šémēš hē^elū 'ōlōt wayyīzē^ehū z^ebāhīm bayyōm hahū l'yahwē "And the Levites took down the ark of Yahweh and the box that was with it in which were objects of gold, and they set [them] on the great stone; and the men of Beth-shemesh offered burnt offerings and sacrificed sacrifices on that day to Yahweh."

There is no doubt that verse 15 presupposes a box or casket in which the offerings of gold had been placed. Verse 11 does not really contradict this, though it is of course compatible with the theory that the "box" was not merely a container for the offerings. Verse 8 has a slight syntactic difficulty that the commentators have perhaps glossed over a little too lightly. Inasmuch as the box which was intended, one might think, to hold these golden mice and hemorrhoids had not yet been referred to by the narrator, it would have been far more natural to say b^eargāz "in a box." Verse 15, almost certainly a relatively late interpolation, as we shall see presently, represents the later Hebrew feeling. The 'argāz, at the time of its composition, must have meant any type of box, large or small, and nothing then seemed more natural than that the original text, of which verse 8 undoubtedly formed a part, should have referred to a casket or similar object in which the jewel-like images were put for safe keeping and which was then put by the side of the ark. If the original text had actually had the reading b^eargāz, there could have been no motive for "correcting" it to bā^eargāz, as this reading would introduce a needless difficulty, an implication not entirely in accord with the current understanding of the passage. Smith⁹ says: "pointed with the article, which, however, may mean no more than *the* box which was necessary for the purpose. On the other hand, the punctuators may have supposed the 'rgz a necessary part of every cart." Driver¹⁰ is equally ready to believe that the article is a sort of accident. "It is possible, of course," he states, "that an 'rgz may have formed a regular appendage to an 'glh, in which case the art. will be prefixed to it as denoting an object expected, under the circumstances named, to exist . . .; but there are many passages to which this explanation will not apply, and the rendering 'a chest' is perfectly in accordance with Hebrew idiom."

In spite of Smith's willingness to credit the Massoretes with a

⁹ *Op. cit.*, p. 45.

¹⁰ *Notes on the Hebrew Text and the Topography of the Books of Samuel*, 2nd ed., 1913, p. 54.

needless misunderstanding, of Driver's assurance of the legitimacy of a somewhat inappropriate use of the definite article, and of the implication of verse 15, we shall, as usual, do better to accept the more difficult horn of the dilemma. What is to prevent us from assuming that "in the box" meant, precisely, "in the box of the cart"? If the "gālā of the narrative was a typical Philistine cart—and why should it not have been?—it would have to be the box-cart, consisting essentially of two solid, unspoked wheels with connecting shaft and a surmounting, probably easily removable, box, which we find illustrated in the well-known Egyptian repre-




FIG. 1. A Philistine box-cart drawn by a team of oxen. The four oxen are probably merely a symbolic device for the multiplication of cart and team of two.

sensation from Medīnet Hābu, of the carts of the Purasati (Philistines); see fig. 1.¹¹ The wheel-set was, no doubt, the original "gālā "roller," while the box attached to it was probably the 'argāz of verse 8. If this interpretation is correct, the objects of gold were not put in a special container but were simply set up next to the ark of Yahweh, which, being a more bulky object and probably protruding above it, perhaps strapped to both the box and the wheel-shaft, could not exactly be said to have been "put in"

¹¹ Taken from Hugo Gressmann, *Altorientalische Bilder zum alten Testament*, 1926, no. 111 (my thanks are due to Mr. Allan Smith, of the Department of Anthropology of Yale University, for the drawing). The battle scene from which this box-cart and ox team are lifted, has been often reproduced. Other convenient references are: R. A. S. Macalister, *The Philistines*, p. 118; and A. Jeremias, *Das alte Testament im Lichte des alten Orients*, 1930, p. 520.

the cart or the box of the cart but was, quite naturally, "attached to" it (this would justify the 'el "to," generally emended to 'al "on"). *bā'argāz miššiddō*, by the way, does not mean "in the box at its side," which is an Anglicism and not as literal a translation as it seems to be. Were that the meaning, the text would presumably have read *bā'argāz 'āšēr miššiddō*. The true meaning is "in the box [and] at its (the ark's) side."

The Septuagint version, ἐν θέματι βερεχθάν (or βερεχθάν), is hard to get much out of. Presumably βερεχθάν is a badly corrupted form of the Hebrew *b'rgz* (+?) and ἐν θέματι its gloss.¹² *θέμα*, literally "a placing," glosses Hebrew *mā'rāḥā* "order" in certain passages¹³ but the *θέματι* of verse 8 and the *θέμα* of verses 11 and 15 must have an entirely different meaning. Is it a technical term, equivalent to "frame," for the "box of a cart," current in the Hellenistic Greek of Alexandria? In that case it would be etymologically related to, but significantly different from, the ordinary *θήκη* "case, box, chest." *θέμα* of verses 11 and 15 would be a mechanical repetition of the *θέματι* of verse 8 to harmonize with the Hebrew text. τὰ σκεύη τὰ χρυσᾶ of the Septuagint, corresponding to the Hebrew *kēlê ḥazzāhāh*, in spite of the wide range of meaning covered by both *σκεῦος* and *kēlî*, goes better with a specific "vessels of gold" than with the more indefinite "objects of gold" or with "ornaments, jewels of gold." In other words, these golden objects are likely to have been fairly large vessel-like images set up in the box-cart rather than carefully wrought, jewel-like, images put away in a casket. The "gold" is more likely to have been a gold overlay than solid workmanship.¹⁴

If our interpretation of the *'argāz* of verse 8 is correct, verses 11 and 15 must be interpolations, in whole or in part, for they imply a meaning for *'argāz* that is hardly compatible with that of a part of the cart itself. The commentators have judged them to be interpolations for quite other reasons.

1. In regard to the half-verse "*w'ēt ḥā'argāz . . . ṭhōrēhēm*"

¹² See F. Wutz, *Die Transkriptionen von der Septuaginta bis zu Hieronymus*, 1925, p. 54.

¹³ See Smith, *op. cit.*, p. 46.

¹⁴ See Benzinger, *Hebräische Archäologie*, 1927, p. 220; and figures 229 (bronze), 238-243 (clay) for comparable effigy vessels from early Palestine (steer, camel and rider, fox-head, lion's head, duck, bird and pomegranate, bird).

of 11 Smith says:¹⁵ "Comparison of the copies of *Ḡ* shows so many variations, in the words and their arrangement, that we must suppose the original *Ḡ* to have been supplemented in various ways to bring it into harmony with *Ṣ*."

2. In all passages of this episode, except verses 11 and 17,¹⁶ the hemorrhoids are referred to in the *Kt.* as '*plym*, a coarse and obviously original word, for which a toned down *Qr.* *ṭḥḏrīm* was substituted in the actual reading at a later period.¹⁷ Hence 11b must have been composed at a time, long after the original narrative was fixed, when the less coarse reading had become conventional and alone strictly possible.¹⁸

3. Verse 15 is a disturbing interruption to the narrative, for in the preceding verse the wood of the cart has already been split and the cows offered up to Yahweh as a burnt offering.

4. The Levites are entirely out of place in this narrative. They were obviously inserted because later feeling found them ritually necessary. As Smith says, "A late editor or scribe could not reconcile the free handling of the Ark by the men of Beth-Shemesh with the legal prescription."¹⁹ And, as Ehrlich pertinently remarks,²⁰ there is no Beth-shemesh mentioned among the Levite cities enumerated in Joshua 20:20-40.

In other words, the meaning of '*argāz*, "box of a cart," which we have tried to establish for the early period, during which the word was taken over by the Israelites as a Philistine loanword, can be maintained on the authority of verse 8 alone. The cultural tone of verses 11 and 15 is later in more respects than one, including a wider and less technical use of '*argāz* than is proper to the original narrative. It is of some importance to note that the earliest Israelite culture of Palestine probably did not include the cart, though knowledge of it was undoubtedly had by contact with

¹⁵ *Op. cit.*, p. 47.

¹⁶ Verse 17, with its rationalized enumeration of the five golden hemorrhoids, one for each of the five Philistine towns, is almost certainly an interpolation, for the actual narrative refers to only three of the Philistine towns: Ashdod, Gath, and Ekron.

¹⁷ See V 6, 9, 12; VI 4, 5.

¹⁸ "Though some MSS. here conform to the usage elsewhere," remarks Smith, *ibid.*, "reading '*plyhm* in the *Kt.*" This, in all likelihood, is a pseudo-archaism.

¹⁹ Smith, *op. cit.*, p. 47.

²⁰ A. B. Ehrlich, *Randglossen zur hebräischen Bibel*, III, 1910, p. 190.

Egyptians and Philistines.²¹ It is perfectly natural, therefore, that a Hebrew word for the box of a cart should have been borrowed from Philistine, spoken in a coastal plain where cart traction was easy and useful.

Philistine *argaz or *argaz "box of a cart," perhaps also "box" in general, must have Anatolian-Aegean parallels. This is not the place to discuss the ethnic position of the Philistines. For us it is enough to state that they are known from a variety of sources to belong to the Anatolian-Aegean area, that they gradually worked their way south through Syria into Palestine circa 1100 B. C., and that they spoke a language that was completely at variance with any of those spoken in Palestine before their arrival.²² Too little is known of Philistine to enable us to place it linguistically with any confidence, but what little we do know points clearly to an Anatolian-Aegean environment.²³ It is entirely possible, and even probable, that the Anatolian-Aegean linguistic group of which

²¹ See H. A. White, "Cart," in J. Hastings, *A Dictionary of the Bible*, I. 357. See also Benzinger, *op. cit.*, p. 161; A. Bertholet, *Kulturgeschichte Israels*, pp. 159, 179, 190.

²² The literature on the Philistines is considerable. Reference may be made to Macalister, *op. cit.*; Galling, article "Philister" in Ebert, *Reallexikon der Vorgeschichte*, 10, 1927-28, pp. 126-133.

²³ I refer particularly to Hebrew (<Philistine) *serānīm*, construct state *sarn-ē*, "lords (of Philistines only," whose s- (*sāmēš*) points to earlier *ts-: *tsarn-* "lord," cf. Greek (<pre-Greek) *rupavros*, Etruscan (loanword?) *turan* "lady." (This group of words is generally taken to be pre-IE but we are beginning to see more and more clearly that, quite aside from Achæan and from Hittite-Luwian, IE dialects were spoken in the Anatolian-Aegean area at a very early time. In another connection I hope to show that **tura-n-* is a pre-Greek but IE term for "lord, despot," and that Philistine belongs to that as yet ill-defined group of IE "pre-Greek" dialects in which this word was at home.) Another important bit of linguistic evidence bearing on the Philistine problem is Philistine *padī*, concerning which W. Brandenstein writes (article "Kretische Sprache," p. 202, in Pauly-Wissowa, *Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, Supplementband VI, 1935): "Nun haben wir Eigennamen philistäischer Herren in Syrien; die sind aber offenbar einheimisch, und zwar meist subaräisch oder indisch (weil die Subaräer zum Teil indische Herren gehabt hatten); vgl. z. B. den Philistertitel *padī*, der an altind. *pāti* 'Herr' anklängt." There is no reason to derive Philistine *padī* from an Indic source. The word is, of course, common IE property (cf. Greek *πόσις* < **pósis* < **pótiš*; Lith. *-pati-s*, *-pats*; Toch. A *pats*) and is more likely than not to be a native word. It shares with *argaz two phonetic changes posited in the text for Philistine: IE *o* > Philistine *a*; and voicing (or becoming unvoiced lenis) of IE medial *p*, *t*, *k* to Philistine *b*, *d*, *g*.

The Philistine **argaz* illustrates two well-known Anatolian isoglosses: 1. brightening of older *o* to *a*; 2. softening of old fortis stops (*p*, *t*, *k*) to voiceless lenis (or voiced lenis) stops (*B*, *D*, *G*; or *b*, *d*, *g*) after *l*, *m*, *n*. Both of these processes are illustrated by Hittite. Anatolian *-nd-* : Aegean *-nth-* < older *-nt-*, which has been so often discussed, is merely a particularly common case of a larger group of sound changes. Hit. *arkuwar*, e. g., is to be understood as *arg(u)war* < IE **ark-*, just as participles in *-nt-*, *-nd-* are to be understood as *-nd-* < IE *-nt-*. Much clearer than the confusing orthographies of Hittite, Greek transcriptions, and the Epichoric alphabets (which are probably not thoroughly understood as yet in a phonetic sense), are the sound changes in Armenian, which I believe to be representative of old Anatolian isoglosses.²⁷ As is well known, IE *p-*, *t-*, *k-* develop to Arm. *h-* (no doubt via *p'-*; > *px-* > *x-* > *h-*, as I hope to show at another time), *t'-*, *k'-* (palatalized, *č-*); but after *n* and *r* they develop in the opposite direction, softening to *b*(?), *d*, *g*; e. g., *dr-and*, *dr-andi* "door-post" : Lat. *antae*, *ard* "now" : Gk. *ἄρτι*, *hing* "five" : Gk. *πέντε*, *argel* : Gk. *ἀρκέω*. Philistine *-rg-* (read probably *-rg-*)²⁸ and Armenian *-rg-*, both from IE *-rk-*, reflect the same Anatolian phonetic process.

The relation of Hebrew *'argāz*, Philistine **argaz*, to Latin *arca*, generally, but perhaps not correctly, directly derived from *arcēre*, will be taken up in another paper, which may be considered the sequel of the present one.

Namen der Lykier, *Klio*, 11tes Beiheft, 1913, pp. 130, 116-17, 131). By *B*, *D*, *G*, are meant voiceless lenis stops, heard by Greeks and Romans as either *b* or *p*, *d* or *t*, *g* or *k* respectively, but by Semites, whose *p*, *t*, and *k* were probably aspirated, as simple *b*, *d*, and *g* (hence Philistine *-rg-* heard as *-rg-*). Such Greek variants as *γ-k* (e. g. Cilician *Κλους* : Karian *Γλους*, *Γλως*; see Sundwall, *op. cit.*, p. 109) vs. persistent *κ*, *k* (e. g. Lycæonian *Καλπος*, Karian *Καλπις*, *Κολβα(s)*, Lycian *Καλβιος*, Pamphylian *Κολβασσα*, *Κολβασσα*, Lydian *Colpe*; *op. cit.*, pp. 108-9) probably indicate the same contrast as is indicated in Hittite cuneiform orthography by medial *-k-* (or *-g-*) vs. *-kk-* (or *-gg-*).

²⁷ These correspondences are one of several reasons for a serious doubt as to whether we are justified, after all, in thinking of Armenian as an offshoot of Phrygian. This popular theory has never been at all adequately proved.

²⁸ The *-g-* is perhaps directly perceptible in the Greek *-κ-*, *-γ-*, of certain Anatolian place names: Isaurian-Pisidian *Αρκαστηνος*, Milesian *Αργασις*, Karpathos *Αρκασιεύς* (Sundwall, *op. cit.*, p. 72), but we have no right to assume that these names contain the **argāz* we have reconstructed.

TWO HITTITE WORDS

E. H. STURTEVANT

YALE UNIVERSITY

1. *suppariya-*

THE HITTITE verb *suppariya-* has been studied briefly by Ehelolf.¹ It occurs in an unpublished text (*Bo.* 706. 2. 24 f.) in a sentence which Ehelolf cites and translates as follows:² (24) *DTE-ŠI-MI-wa-kán a-aš-ši-ya-an-ti* (25) *gi-mu-wa ša-ni-iz-zi-uš ti-eš-ly-uš šu-up-pa-ri-ya-an-za*, "In dem geliebten Schosse der Göttin Tešimi warst du in süsse Träume eingehüllt(??)." Ehelolf's comment on the participle is as follows: "*šu-up-pa-ri-ya-an-za*: die Bedeutung ist lediglich nach der Konstruktion des Verbums geraten. Allerdings kennt das heth. *wass(iya)-* 'bekleiden, anziehen' bei passiver Wendung ein derartiges 'Sachobject' nicht, verlangt vielmehr den Instrumental (*IŠ-TU* . . . *KBo.* 2. 16. 1. 2; 4. 6. 1. 29; *KUB* 10. 53. 3; *KAT-it KBo.* 4. 9. 5. 19). — š. demnach ganz anders zu deuten? Etwa gar 'schlafen'? Dafür spricht vielleicht *KUB* 20. 86. 5. 9 f. (9: *a-pi-e-da-ni iš-p[a-an-ti]*!)."

I do not quite understand how Ehelolf arrived at the interpretation "eingehüllt(??)," but his remarks on the construction of the verbs *wassiya-* and *wess-*, *wass-* "clothe, put on" clearly show that the interpretation is unsatisfactory. The alternative interpretation "schlafen," however, suits the context perfectly,³ and is confirmed, as Ehelolf says, by *KUB* 20. 86. 9 f.: *a-pi-e-da-ni iš-pa-[an-ti]*] (10) *na-aš-ma šu-up-pa-ri-y[a-zi]*]," in that night . . . But he sleeps(?) . . ."

Further support for this interpretation is provided by *KBo.* 5. 4. 2. 37 f. = Friedrich, *Staatsverträge des Hatti-Reiches in hethitischer Sprache* 1. 66: *na-aš-m[a . . . m]a-a-an ERIN.MEŠ ANSU. KUR.R[A.MEŠ]* (38) [*KUR-KA i*]š-tar-na ar-ḫa i-ya-at-ta-ri

¹ *OLZ* 36. 3-5.

² Except that I use my customary form of transcription.

³ It is not certain that *ša-ni-iz-zi-uš* should here be translated "sweet." Since Götze's demonstration (*Lang.* 11. 185-90) that the Hittite word for "one" is *sanna-* (or rather *sana-*; see *ib.* 190 fn. 12, and Hahn, *Lang.* 12. 119), it is clear that the primary meaning of *sanezzis* is "first." There is no doubt of its having also a secondary force "best" in *KUB* 13. 4. 4. 67, 71 and elsewhere.

nu-za šu-up-ša-ri ku-iš-ki na-aš-m[a i]š-tar-ki-ya-az-zi ku-in-ki . . .
 (40) [*na-an*] ERUM-*aḫ-ti na-aš-ma . . .*, "Or . . . if infantry and charioteers march through your country, and one becomes weary or another becomes ill, . . . and you make him a slave, or . . ." The verb *šu-up-ša-ri* is evidently related to *šu-up-pa-ri-ya-*, containing the formative *s* that frequently appears in Hittite verbs. Here one may be inclined to see a desiderative force in the suffix, as often in the Indo-European languages, but I do not know of a parallel in Hittite.

An additional reason for interpreting the two verbs as "sleep" and "become weary" is the obvious etymology that results. I know that such an argument is taboo among certain excellent scholars, but to my way of thinking it amounts to very strong confirmatory evidence, provided the requirements of phonology, morphology, and semantics are fully met. As to phonology, the double *pp* of *suppariya-* shows that we are dealing with IE *p* rather than *b* or *bh*; both verbs may regularly correspond with IE *sup-*. The formative elements of *suppariya-* reappear in *gimmantariya-* "pass the winter" beside *gimmanza* "winter," *pangariya-* "be common, be prevalent" beside *pankus* "all, whole; general, widespread," *sakuwantariya-* "rest" beside *sakuwannanza* (IGI-*wa-an-na-an-za*)⁴ "dilatory"? and *sakuwa(e)-* "cause to rest." The second part of the complex *ariya-* is, of course, the suffix *iya-* (IE *io-*), which is used most frequently to form verbs from nouns or adjectives.⁵ This structure is demonstrated for *pangariya-* by the instrumental adverb *pangarit* "in mass, in great numbers".⁶

It seems probable, then, that Hittite had a noun **suppar* "sleep." If we assume that this word was an *r/n*-stem, we may see traces of the *n*-stem in Skt. *svápnas* and Lat. *somnus* from IE *swépnos* and in Gk. *ἵπνος* from IE *supnós*. The variation in the ablaut of the radical syllable is normal in an *r/n*-stem; cf. Phrygian *βεδν* "water," Arm. *get* "river," OSwed. *vætur* "water": Goth. *watō watins* "water": Gk. *ἵδωρ ἵδατος* "water," Skt. *udnás* (gen.) "water." The available evidence is hardly abundant enough to establish the original declension of such nouns in full, but we can at least say that there were two types of nom.-acc. sg., one with full grade, *o*-grade, or lengthened grade in the radical syllable and with

⁴ Sturtevant, *JAOS* 54. 398.

⁵ Sturtevant, *A Comparative Grammar of the Hittite Language* 225 f.

⁶ See Götze, *Madduwattas* 114 f.

reduced grade in the suffixal syllable (e. g. Gk. *ἔαρ* "blood," Lat. *femur* "thigh," *iecur* "liver;" Skt. *śákṛt* : Gk. *κόπρος* "dung;" Gk. *ἥπαρ* "liver," *φρέαρ* < **φρηφαρ* "spring"), and the other with reduced grade of the radical syllable and lengthened *o*-grade of the suffix (e. g. Gk. *ἰδωρ* < IE *uđōr*). Contamination of these types gives such forms as Gk. *τέκμωρ* (beside *τέκμαρ*) "sign" with full grade plus lengthened *o*-grade and Gk. *πῦρ* = Hittite *pahhur* "fire" apparently with reduced grade in both syllables.

Our assumed Hittite **suppar* should appear in Latin as **supōr*, and I suggest that the familiar *sopōr* is in origin a contaminated stem like Gk. *τέκμωρ*, coming from earlier **swēpōr*. The word has, of course, been assimilated in gender and declension to the masculine *s*-stems. The tendency in all the Indo-European languages is to transfer *r/n*-stems to other declensions, chiefly the *o*-declension, the *r*-declension, and the *n*-declension, but we have also defective nouns which lack either the *r*-cases or the *n*-cases, and some such oddities as Lat. *iter*, *itineris*. When once the Lat. masc. *s*-stem nouns had come to have final *ōr* in the nom. sg. it was easy for them to attract an *r/n*-stem with *ōr* in the nom.-acc. sg., since this category was already somewhat rare and highly unstable. We may suspect a similar transfer in case a *ro*-stem, a *no*-stem, or an *n*-stem stands beside a Latin noun in *ōr*, *ōris*. Such words are *candor* "brightness": Skt. *candrás* "bright," *κάνδαρος* *ἄνθραξ*, Hesych., Skt. *candanas* "sandal wood;" *rubor* "redness": *rubet*, *ερυθρός*, etc. "red;" *stupor* "numbness, dullness": *stuprum* "debauchery," OHG *stobarōn* "obstupere;" *sūdor* "sweat": Gk. *ἰδρός*, Lett. *swiēdri* "sweat;" *tremor* "a trembling": Gk. *τραπερός* "trembling;" *tumor* "a swelling": Skt. *tūmras* "fat, strong" (of cattle), Gk. *σῶμα* "body;" *vapor* "steam, exhalation, vapor": Gk. *καπνός* "smoke."

2. *uwatar*

Hittite *uwatar* (*ú-wa-a-tar*, *ú-wa-tar*) was for a time understood as an action noun from *we/a-* "come."⁷ Götze⁸ was the first to *schungen* 1. 46.

see the connection of the noun with *au-*, *aus-*, *uwa-* "see," which necessarily suggested itself as soon as Friedrich⁹ had shown that

⁷ So Hrozný, *Bog hazkõi-Studien* 1. 75, 3. 230 f., 236 f.; Forrer, *Forschungen* 1. 46.

⁸ *Kleinasiatische Forschungen* 1: 129, 197.

⁹ *ZA NF* 3. 186 fn. 1, 202 f.

ú-wa-an-zi means "they see," *ú-wa-an-ta-at* "they appeared," etc. For Götze the medio-passive character of the verbal nouns in *-tar* was an essential feature of the identification; he insisted¹⁰ upon the parallelism of *uwatar* beside *uwandat* and *asatar* "a sitting" beside *esari* "seat oneself."

Friedrich¹¹ has recently taken issue with Götze on this latter point; he finds that in *KUB* 27. 67. 2. 65 IGI. 𐎶. A-aš *ú-wa-a-tar* means "das Sehen der Augen" and that it is consequently an active rather than a middle verbal noun. Although the passage in question is mutilated I think that Friedrich's interpretation is correct; but it scarcely follows that the noun must be assigned to the active voice, any more than the English noun *sight* must be called active. It is true that the suffix *tar* is used chiefly to form verbal nouns from intransitive verbs,¹² but there is no close connection between the suffix and the voice system of the verb. In contrast to the pair *asatar*: *esari* we have **harkatar*, gen. *harkannas* "destruction": *harkzi* "is destroyed;" *sullatur* "anger, quarrel": *sullaizzi* "is angry, quarrels," **taksulatar*, dat. *taksulanni* "peace, friendship, kindness": *taksulaitzi* "be friendly, be kind." Furthermore many nouns in *tar* have no known verbs beside them. It is the part of caution not to assign the formation any definite place in the verbal system.

Nevertheless Götze's connection of *uwatar* with the stem form *uwa-* "see, appear" is certainly correct. It is confirmed by the phraseological connection of the word with IGI = *sakwa-* "eye" in the passage just discussed and in a number of omen texts. In *KUB* 5. 1. 1. 76, 3. 86, 4. 37; 16. 29. 1. 2, 3; 22. 64. 2. 7 we read IGI. 𐎶. A-wa (or IGI-wa) *ú-wa-tar*, and in *KUB* 5. 1. 2. 51, IGI-wa-aš *ú-wa-tar*. I do not know precisely what the phrase means. Further confirmation comes from a mutilated line in an archaic text, *KBo.* 3. 34. 2. 35: []-at-ta-an ni-ku-ma-an-za *ú-wa-a-tar pi-it-ta-iz-zi*; if we may disregard the first word, the remainder seems to mean, "naked he avoids sight" or rather in this case "being seen." This seems to be part of the punishment for some fault committed during a night spent in the palace.

The phrase *uwatar iya-* occurs six times in the *Annals of Mursilis* and once in the *Annals of Suppiluliyumas*. It is always accom-

¹⁰ *Madd.* 81 fn. 1.

¹¹ *Archiv für Orientforschung* 10. 295.

¹² So Sturtevant, *HG* 149.

panied by the dative of a noun for army or for infantry and chariots or of a pronoun referring to such a noun, and there is always an expression of the place where. Typical is *KBo.* 2. 5. 2. 1 f.: *nu ma-aḥ-ḫa-an ḫa-me-eš-ḫa-an-za ki-ša-at nu-za A-NA KARASŠ* (2) *ú-wa-a-tar I-NA ID ŠA₅ i-ya-nu-un*. Götze, *Annalen des Muršilis* 183, translates, "Und sowie es Frühjahr wurde, stiess ich beim Roten Flusse zum Heer." His idea¹³ is that the phrase originally meant "make an appearance before the army" and then merely "come upon, join the army," always of the king. In all seven passages it is possible to assume that the king does actually join his army, and it is that fact, of course, which led Götze to his interpretation.

I am, however, dissatisfied with it. In the first place I should expect the king to say *uwahhat* "I appeared" rather than *uwatar iyanun* "I made appearance;" such a periphrasis seems out of harmony with the simple Hittite style. Furthermore there is one passage where the sentence under discussion seems quite otiose on Götze's interpretation. *KBo.* 4. 4. 3. 26 ff. = *AM* 126: *nu I-NA URUḪAR-RA-NA an-da-an pa-a-un* (27) *nu-mu KARASŠ I-NA URUḪAR-RA-NA an-da a-ar-aš* (28) *nu-za A-NA KARASŠ ú-wa-a-tar a-pi-ya i-ya-nu-un*, "I went to Harrana; and (my) army came to me in Harrana; and I joined the army there." Here at least the context seems to require some ceremony; either the king exhibits himself to the army or the army is exhibited to him, and the latter is of course the more probable. I should translate, "and I held a review for the army there."

Götze thought of this interpretation, but rejected it, with these words: ¹⁴ "Parade, Truppenschau' ist unmöglich, da die genannten Formen sämtlich medial sind." As I have already stated, I doubt whether they are middle, but in any case the medial meaning "self-display" is entirely appropriate for a military review. In favor of such a meaning for *uwatar iya-* is the fact that the place where the event takes place is always named.

It does not seem worth while to consider in detail the other occurrences in the Annals of Mursilis,¹⁵ but the one from the Annals of Suppiluliyumas requires a word. *KBo.* 5. 6. 2. 26 ff.: *nu-za A-BU-YA ERIN.MEŠ ANŠU.KUR.RA.MEŠ ni-ni-ik-ta* (27) *na-aš L[Ú URU]ḪUR-RI i-i-an-ni-iš na-aš ma-aḥ-ḫa-an I-NA*

¹³ *KLF* 1. 129, 197.¹⁴ *KLF* 1. 197 fn. 7.¹⁵ *KBo.* 2. 5. 3. 23 f.: 4. 4. 3. 59; *KUB* 14. 15. 2. 9 f.: 19. 37. 3. 10.

KUR URUTE-GA-RA-MA (28) *a-ar-[aš n]u-za I-NA URUTA-AL-PA A-NA ERİN.MEŠ ANŠU.KUR.RA.MEŠ* (29) *ú-wa-[a-tar] i-ya-at*, "My father mustered (his) infantry and charioteers, and he was marching (against?) the m[an?] of Hurri; and when he had reached the country of Tegarama, in the town of Talpa he held a review for (his) infantry and charioteers." Götze would take the first *na-aš* in line 27 as referring to ERİN.MEŠ ANŠU.KUR.RA.MEŠ; "and they were marching . . . , and when he had reached the country of Tegarama, in the town of Talpa he joined (his) infantry and charioteers." The mention of both branches of the service in the final sentence seems more natural if we understand *uwatar iyat* to mean "he held a parade." We may add that immediately after the ceremony, whatever it was, the king sent a part of his army away.



AN ARABIC PAPYRUS DATED 205 A. H.

CHARLES C. TORREY

YALE UNIVERSITY

THE DOCUMENT here described is now in the possession of Yale University. It was recently acquired by purchase from a dealer in Cairo, along with a considerable collection consisting mainly of Greek papyri. The strip measures 22.5 x 11.5 cm., and is in the main very well preserved, as may be seen from the accompanying photograph.

The document is a record of sale of real estate, a city lot with its dwelling house and other minor buildings, sold to a man who is named, by two brothers who had inherited the property from their father. The price paid was three hundred dinars in gold. The house was in Alexandria (though this is not actually stated), and its location is briefly described in terms which doubtless fully sufficed in their own day, but are of no use to us now. It evidently was in a city block, for the boundary on one side was the street, and on the other three sides dwellings designated by proper names.¹

After the description of the property and the account of the transaction, there follow the names of seven witnesses, who are declared to have put their signatures to the official deed of sale, which then was deposited (if my conjectural restoration at the bottom of the papyrus is correct) in the *ḍiḥwān* of the Mosque of Alexandria.

The document is legible throughout, though rather carelessly written; and even with careful writing there may of course be some ambiguity. D. S. Margoliouth, in his *Catalogue of the Arabic Papyri in the John Rylands Library*, pp. xvi f., describes the customary script, in which "the same sign is employed for at least nine different letters," while the use of diacritical points is looked upon as "insult to the intelligence of the reader." In the present case, there are very few insults.

¹ If we happened to possess in regard to the topography of Alexandria any such information as we have in the case of al-Fustāt and Cairo, chance might throw light on one or more of these names. But there were no *Hittas* in Alexandria at the time of the Arab conquest, and no description of the city during the early Muslim occupation has come down to us. In this connection, attention may be called to the very interesting article by Kahle, "Die Katastrophe des mittelalterlichen Alexandria," in the *Mémoires de l'Institut Français* 68 (1935), pp. 137-154.

[illegible]

بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم

- 1 هذا ما اشترى افعدة بن جريرة الزمردى اشترى من توسى
- 2 وفقرى بنى انثر اشترى منهم مصابة انثر (ابو) ابى فقرى
- 3 الذى كان توسى وفقرى (وزوئها) وزوئها من (ابوهم) ابىهم انثر وهو المنزل
- 4 الذى يكون فى الدار مع آبائى. اشترى ذلك منهم بثلثمائة الدينير
- 5 عينا ذهبيا (و) فقد وصلت الى توسى [و] فقرى الفلّة (السر) الدنانير
- 6 وبرى فيها افعدة اليهم. وتوسى [و] فقرى عندما باعوا افعدة
- 7 هذه [هـ] المصابة التى وزوئها من انثر فى صحة من عقلهم وحسهم
- 8 بمدخلها ومخرجها واسفلها واعلاها. فان (ادعا) ادعى دغيا من
- 9 ادا (سى) شيئا بوجه من الوجوه او بسبب من الاسباب فعلى توسى
- 10 وفقرى يعاد ذلك من خالص مالهم. وحدّ حدود هذه
- 11 الذى اشتراها افعدة من توسى وفقرى القبلى الطريق وحدّها
- 12 (الرحى) البخرى منزل كيسان وحدّها الغربى منزل الفن (?) وحدّها
- 13 الشرقى منزل بحير. اشتراء ذلك منهم (لئنه) بثلثمائة الدينير عينا ذهبيا
- 14 شهد على اقرء توسى (ومقر) وفقرى فيها نفسا. واشهدّها جائز
- 15 امرها يعرف ما لها وما عليها: مرقس بن اسحق
- 16 وكتب عينا عينا القاء ألواح شهادته بعلمه وحضرته
- 17 وابنولة بن هرون وكتب عينا عينا القاء شهادته بعلمه
- 18 وحضرة وقزمان من (نا) بنى هرون وكتب عينا عينا القاء شهادته [هـ]
- 19 بعلمه وحضرته وسهؤ (?) بن هرون وكتب عينا
- 20 عينا القاء شهادته بعلمه وحضرته
- 21 واسحاق بن ابراهيم القرشى وكتب شهادته بيده
- 22 وابراهيم بن ايوب (?) وكتب عينا عينا القاء شهادته بعلمه وحضرته
- 23 وصنيرف بن فرفة وكتب [عينا] عينا القاء شهادته بمخض فيه
- 24 [بمس] جد اسكندرية [ف] [الديوان]. وكتب فى رمضان
- 25 سنة خمس و[مائتين]

Words which are miswritten in the original text I have put in parentheses followed by the true reading. Square brackets are used for the words or letters which must be supplied where there is accidental omission or where the papyrus has been broken away. The script closely resembles that of a similar papyrus document (deed of sale) of the year 239, now in the Khedivial Library in Cairo, published by B. Moritz, *Arabic Palaeography* (Cairo, 1905), No. 112.

In the translation which is here offered, the main difficulty is with the proper names, especially those of the persons who are named in the account of the transaction. These are all unfamiliar to me; and since even the consonants are frequently uncertain, my translation is mere guesswork. I have not wished to overload the text with question marks, but they may be understood wherever a strange name appears. Others may be able to correct my readings.

TRANSLATION

This is that which Afida b. Jarjara az-Zumrudī purchased from Tūsī (2) and Faqrī, the sons of Anfar. He bought from them the estate of Anfar Abū Faqrī, (3) which Tūsī and Faqrī had inherited from their father Anfar; and it is the dwelling house (4) which is in the enclosure with certain (other) buildings.

He bought this from them for 300 dinars, (5) in gold coin. The whole amount of the dinars was delivered to Tūsī and Faqrī, (6) and by it (this payment) Afida became free of obligation to them.

Tūsī and Faqrī, at the time when they sold to Afida (7) this estate which they had inherited from Anfar, were of sound mind, and well aware (8) of its income and its outgo, its lowest and its highest.

If a claim shall be made by any one who (9) has paid out anything, in any matter or for any reason whatsoever, then upon Tūsī (10) and Faqrī that shall revert for settlement from their own property.

The boundaries of this (11) which Afida has purchased from Tūsī and Faqrī: The eastern boundary is the street; its boundary (12) on the north is the dwelling of Kaisān; its western boundary is the *manzil* al-Fann(?); and its boundary (13) on the east is the dwelling of Bahīr.

The purchase of this from them for 300 dinars in gold coin (14) was attested by giving Tūsī and Faqrī the reading of it in person.

The following witnessed it as a lawful (15) transaction, with knowledge of its pros and its cons: Marqus b. Ishāq (16)—he wrote in detail ("item by item"), submitting the tablets of his testimony to his knowledge and his presence. (17) And Abtūla(?) b. Hārūn—he wrote in detail the submission of his testimony to his knowledge (18) and his presence. And Quzmān, of the Banī Hārūn—he wrote in detail the submission of his testimony (19) to his knowledge and his presence. And Sahw(?) b. Hārūn—he wrote in (20) detail the submission of his testimony to his knowledge and his presence. (21) And Ishāq b. Ibrāhīm al-Qurašī—he wrote his witness with his own hand. (22) And Ibrāhīm b. Ayyūb—he wrote in detail the submission of his testimony to his knowledge and his presence. (23) And Šairaf b. Farfara(?)—he wrote in detail the submission of his testimony: (all this) in a formal document concerning it (the transaction) (24) in the Mosque of Alexandria, in the *dīwān*.

And this was written in (the month of) Ramaḍān, (25) in the year 205.

NOTES

Line 1. I take the *nisba* from Zumrūd, given in Ibn Duqmāq V. 90, as one of the towns of western Egypt.—The first consonant of "Tūsī" is assured by the pointing in line 5. The *nūn* of "Anfar" is certified in lines 2 and 7.

Line 2. The word مصابغة (in this line written with final *tā*) seems to be a technical term for "estate, inheritance."

Line 3. The reading of the ms., وروى, is possible; but the form *fu'āl* as plural of the active participle is used chiefly in poetry, and the verb, as in line 7, was doubtless intended.

Line 5. I think it probable that الله is simply the scribe's labor-saving way of writing الذلهمات, cf. line 13; but the reading in the text is possible. The word *dīnār* is written defectively as in line 4, and elsewhere.

Line 12. The familiar name *Kaisān* is probably intended; as also, in the following line, the equally common name Bahīr.—What to make of الفن (which certainly seems to be the reading of the ms.) is a question. It is hardly the name of a person. الفىء, "booty, plunder," and الفر, "fugitives," are possibilities.

Line 14. The correct grammatical form would be جائزاً.

Lines 16 ff. Each witness testifies to his full knowledge of the transaction, and to his presence in person.

Line 17. The second and third consonants of the first name are merely guessed at.—The Hārūn who appears so prominently in these lines, evidently a very well known person, is quite likely Hārūn b. Abdallāh az-Zuhri, who was made *qāḍī* in al-Fustāṭ by the caliph al-Ma'mūn in the year 217. See Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam, p. 246, and al-Kindī's *Governors and Judges of Egypt*, ed. Guest, pp. 443 ff.

Line 21. The *nisba* is badly written, but is pretty certainly to be read as I have interpreted. Al-Kindī, p. 418, lines 4 ff., mentions an Ishāq b. Ibrāhīm al-Quraṣī as one who was familiar with the law courts of Egypt at just this time.

Line 22. Al-Kindī, in his account of the judges and judicial proceedings of this time, makes occasional mention of an Ibrāhīm b. [Abī] Ayyūb (the "Abī" is more than once omitted), a scribe of the court, who eventually was entrusted with some important affairs. In his later years he was in disgrace, charged with having stolen 30,000 dinars from the court treasury. Ibn Ḥajar (in Guest's *Governors and Judges*, p. 507) narrates how the man was mobbed and barely escaped with his life, in the year 246.

Line 23. The names are perfectly uncertain, and the possibilities are many.

Lines 24 f. There are bad holes in the papyrus, but the restoration of the text is almost necessarily as given. The date is quite certain.

ILLUMINATING THE THRONES AT THE EGYPTIAN JUBILEE

JOHN A. WILSON
UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

IN 1907 PROFESSOR BREASTED and Mr. N. de G. Davies spent a few days copying and photographing Amenhotep III's temple at Soleb between the Second and Third Cataracts.¹ The most important reliefs in this temple are those which illustrate the royal jubilee or *sed* festival. A few years ago Professor Breasted turned over to me his notebooks and photographs for study and possible publication. The following notes present preliminary observations on an interesting ceremony in the royal jubilee of ancient Egypt.

We are concerned here with four scenes on the Pylon which depict the carrying of torches. These scenes have been partly published by Lepsius, *Denkmäler aus Aegypten und Aethiopien*, III, Pl. 84 *a-b*. Lepsius' copy does not make it clear that there are four scenes, running A-B-C-D from left to right.² The two central scenes, B-C, balance each other, each showing Amenhotep III and Queen Tiy facing a shrine which contains a throne. Lepsius' copyists did not observe that there are actually two such shrines or baldachins shown back to back. They copied as though there were only one structure. These are obviously the two baldachins which are the central feature of the jubilee ceremony. Pharaoh is shown here holding a torch before each. As far as one is able to discern on a badly broken wall, the scenes and inscriptions in B and C are identical. We have a ceremony of illuminating the two jubilee thrones.

The two outer scenes, A and D, are not identical. The scene A, on the left, is almost wholly lost. Just enough is visible to relate

¹ Cf. James H. Breasted, "Second Preliminary Report of the Egyptian Expedition," *American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures*, 25 (Oct., 1908), reprinted as *The Monuments of Sudanese Nubia*, p. 83 ff.

² The wall is badly damaged, and only careful study reveals the details. The correlation of Lepsius' Pl. 84a and 84b with the scenes A-B-C-D is as follows:

[—84a—] [—84b—]
[—A—] [—B—] [—C—] [—D—]

it to the ceremony of illumination and to suggest that it depicts the first act in that ceremony.

We thus move from A through B and C to D, which shows the final act of the ceremony, the distribution to various priests and officiants of the fire which had illuminated the thrones.

The state of the wall does not permit full and final translation. Collation on the spot would answer a number of questions. The main elements of the ceremony may be gathered from Lepsius' copy, supplemented by Breasted's notes and controlled by very satisfactory photographs.

Scene A—Bringing the Fire

The copies have nothing on this scene, and very little is visible in the photographs, as the wall is sadly battered. Three (probably originally five) men move rapidly toward the right (scene B), each man carrying a torch. At the right one man meets them with arm outstretched, palm upward. The once extensive inscriptions have almost wholly perished, except for isolated words: "chief lector priest," "according to his office," and "baldachin."

Scenes B and C—Illuminating the Thrones

As stated above, the two scenes appear to be identical. The description and translation therefore draw impartially from both.

In each scene an elaborately decorated shrine with opened door contains a throne. Amenhotep III and Queen Tiy face this baldachin. He holds out a torch toward the open door, apparently throwing light on the throne in the shrine. Between the baldachin and the King there is a chest of ointments. At the bottom of the scene the *sem* priest Merire turns toward the King and holds out a torch, while the chief lector priest Nebmerutef recites the ritual.

Two vertical lines of inscription describe the scene as the act of *ḥf* (with fire determinative) *ḥntst* (with stairs determinative), which I have rendered "illuminating the baldachin."

"Illuminating the baldachin of — in the jubilee festival, from the 4th month of the 2nd season, day 26, to the 1st month of the 3rd season, day 1. [Fourth month of the 2nd season], day 26, at daybreak of the jubilee festivals—words spoken by the [chief] lector priest: 'Oh *sem* priest, let a flame be brought and given to the King! Oh King, take a light from the torch which illuminated [the baldachin]!'"

The texts immediately in front of the King are obscure. They may not deal with the Horus eye at all. Tentatively one may read: "The King. Words to be spoken four times: 'Oh King Nebmare, Son of Re: [Amenhotep]! Oh Horus, the Son of Re brings his eye! Oh Horus, make sound his eye!'"

The chest or booth between the King and the shrine contains six small compartments at the top and seven small bowls at the bottom. It is labeled: "The booth of mysterious ointment which was brought for the illumination of the baldachin." Each of the six small compartments contains a named deity. These are difficult to read, but seem to be: 1. a seated figure with falcon(?) head, name lost; 2. a bull or cow, name lost; 3. a seated "ape" ("n"); 4. an "ibis" (*thn*); 5. a seated "Anubis"; 6. a crouching lioness, "Pakht." I do not know the function of this chest at the ceremony.

Scene D—Distributing the Flame

The chief lector priest stands at the left and faces a procession of individuals moving toward him, each holding a torch. Apparently he distributes to them flame from the sacred ceremony of illuminating the two thrones.

Beside the lector priest an inscription runs: "Reciting by the chief lector priest, so that they may repeat the words; [the chief lector priest, Nebmeru]tef." Those advancing officials whose names are preserved are "the *sem* priest and chief priest of Amon, Merire" and "the lector priest of the phyles and second priest of Amon, Simut." A group on the right is designated as a "council" (*ḏḏḏt*), but the rest of the inscription is broken.³

Above the line of moving officiants there is a lengthy inscription, which repeats a formula six times: "Words spoken by the chief lector priest: 'Oh X, let a flame be brought and given to Y! Oh Y, take a light from the torch which illuminated the baldachin!'" This is the same speech which we met in scenes B and C. Here the lector priest of the phyles is asked to give a light to the *sem* priest; the "Guardian of the Place" to give a light to the "Great One of Upper Egypt"; the "Guardian of the Broad

³I am tempted to read the traces "the council which is in the temple of Khammat," Khammat being the old name of Soleb. This would indicate that a jubilee ceremony actually took place at that distant site. But the traces will not support any translation, I fear.

Hall" to give a light to the chief magician; the "Chief of the Great Ones" to give a light to (name lost); (name lost) to give a light to the chief magician; and the "—— of the Place" to give a light to the "Mother of the God."

It is not clear what is then done with the distributed flames. The mention of various gods in the text—Re, Atum, Khnum, Isis, Khepre, and "the two great gods, the two brothers, . . . Horus and Khepre"—suggests that the flame is to be carried to various temples or chapels. But it is also possible that the texts are invoking the favor of the gods named.

Much remains obscure. It is not clear where the flame came from in the first instance nor where it went ultimately. What is certain is that the illuminating of the two thrones was an important ceremonial of the jubilee festival. As the original purpose of the jubilee festival is still in some doubt, we cannot state that we have here a primitive rite of fire connected with kingship.⁴ On the surface of it, the significance seems to be not fire, but light, the illumination of two shrines which had long been closed to the light. Such illumination was a feature of the daily ritual of the god and would be appropriate also in the jubilee festival.

⁴ Cf. Fraser, *The Golden Bough*, II, *The Magic Art*, p. 261 and *passim*.

THE *t*-FORM OF THE OLD BABYLONIAN VERB

ALBRECHT GOETZE

YALE UNIVERSITY

THE SEMITIC verb which is regularly based on tri-radical roots can be modified in its meaning through the doubling of the middle radical or the addition of certain syllables, mostly in the form of prefixes. One of these syllables is *ta*. In primitive Semitic it was partly prefixed, and partly infix; in Akkadian, the latter method became standard throughout.¹

By means of the modifying syllables the individual Semitic languages developed different systems of verb classes (conjugations). In Akkadian, the following system was used:²

primary verb:	<i>i-prus</i>	"he separated, decided."
factive:	<i>u-parris</i>	"he made separate, etc."
causative:	<i>u-ša-pris</i>	"he caused to separate, etc."
passive:	<i>*i-n-paris</i> > <i>ipparis</i>	"he became separated, etc."

It may be added that the Akkadian language uses these forms as a preterit. To each of these preterits corresponds a present-future (*i-parras*, *u-parras*, *u-ša-pras*, *ipparras* "he separates, etc." respectively) and a so-called permansive, denoting the unchanging state or condition in which a person or thing continues to remain (*paris*, *purrus*, *šu-prus*, *na-prus* "he is separated, etc." respectively).

For the purpose of the present paper it must be noted that in addition to the indicatives quoted above there exists (characterized by a suffixed *-u*), a subjunctive, and furthermore, particularly with verbs of movement, also a third "mood" which denotes the termination of the movement implied. It is derived from the preterit or present by the addition of a suffix that terminates in *m*; e. g. *illik* "he went," *illikam* "he came here, he arrived." It was

¹ The distribution in primitive Semitic was in all probability: infix *t* in roots whose first radical is a sibilant, prefixed *t* in all other cases. The former was due most probably to metathesis. Cf. C. Brockelmann, *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der semitischen Sprachen* I § 98b; L. H. Gray, *Introduction to Semitic Comparative Linguistics* § 50.

² Cf. the current grammars, among which A. Ungnad's *Babylonisch-Assyrische Grammatik* (2nd ed. 1926) is the latest.

formerly called "energicus";³ instead of that the term "ventive" has been introduced more recently;⁴ the designation "terminative" seems, however, more accurately descriptive and will be used hereafter.

The system thus outlined has in Akkadian a set of parallel forms containing the syllable *ta*. This *ta* is inserted after the first radical in the primary and the factitive conjugations, but in the causative and the passive conjugations it is placed after the respective conjugation marks, which in such instances lose their accompanying vowels. Accordingly, the forms are as follows:⁵

primary verb:	<i>i-p-ta-ras</i>	<i>i-p-ta-rras</i>	<i>pi-t-rus</i>
factitive:	<i>u-p-ta-rris</i>	<i>u-p-ta-rras</i>	<i>pu-ta-rrus</i>
causative:	<i>u-š-ta-pris</i>	<i>u-š-ta-pras</i>	<i>šu-ta-prus</i>
passive:	<i>*i-n-ta-pras</i> > <i>ittapras</i>	<i>*i-n-ta-pras</i> > <i>ittapras</i>	<i>i-ta-prus</i>

The function of these forms has not yet been determined satisfactorily. It is the purpose of the present paper to discuss this matter at length.

The problem is by no means new. It was recognized and discussed by the early Assyriologists. The related Semitic languages suggested a reflexive-reciprocal, middle, or passive force.⁶ But it was apparent from the outset that recourse to them was of little help in the determination of the Akkadian usage. As a matter of fact, the statement found in Delitzsch's *Assyrische Grammatik* (2nd ed. 1906), which embodies the results of the previous period of research, is far from satisfactory:⁷ "Die Stämme I 2–III 2⁸ haben eigentlich reflexive Bedeutung, doch lässt sich nicht immer

³ Because of its alleged identity with the energetic mood of Arabic grammar. Hebrew grammar has also a "nūn energicum." Cf. also V. Christian, *ZA NF* 2. 71-73; J. Lewy, *ZA NF* 2. 162 f.

⁴ B. Landsberger, *ZA NF* 1. 113-23. This term has since been used by the "Leipzig school."

⁵ Cf. again the current grammars.

⁶ C. Brockelmann, *Grundriss* § 257e; L. H. Gray, *Introduction* § 325.

⁷ § 118, on p. 238.

⁸ In his *Handwörterbuch* as well as in his grammar Delitzsch uses the Roman numerals I, II, III, IV for the primary, factitive, causative, and passive conjugation respectively, and indicates the corresponding *t*-forms by adding the Arabic numeral 2.

. . . ein ausgesprochener Unterschied zwischen ihnen und den entsprechenden, gleichzeitig gebräuchlichen, einfachen Stämmen I 1-III 1 erkennen. Dagegen hat sich mit allen diesen Reflexivstämmen, vor allem mit II 2 und III 2, zugleich auch passive Bedeutung verbunden."⁹

A. Ungnad who has written the most modern grammar of the Akkadian language also assumes a primary middle force (*op. cit.* § 33 b). He adds however (§§ 38 ff.) that this significance tended to disappear in the course of time, so that in most occurrences a difference between the verbal forms with *ta*, and those without it, is no longer recognizable.

A divergent opinion on the *t*-form is held by B. Landsberger. Unfortunately it has never been comprehensively set forth; only a few of his remarks on the subject are available in print.¹⁰ They are to the effect that the *t*-form is used as a punctual present—"he is going to do something." The assertion seems to be based on the observation that in the Code of Hammurabi the conditional clauses beginning with *šumma* "given, supposing that," wherever they contain several verbs, regularly show the sequence primary preterit—*t*-form. Accordingly, then, in Landsberger's opinion *iprus* denotes an earlier stage of action, *iptaras* a later one; therefore *iprus* became preterit and *iptaras* present. Finally the system was completed by adding *iparras* as a future (and durative present).¹¹

Most recently A. L. Oppenheim has treated the problem anew.¹² He maintains that the *t*-form was first used to express emotion ("gefühlbetont"); afterward it assumed perfective force, and finally became a perfect proper. As will be shown, Oppenheim—although he was on the right track—missed the main point; he

⁹ This interpretation disregards IV 2, because IV 1 has itself passive force.

¹⁰ *Isimica* 2 (1926) 361. Landsberger's opinions are reflected also in G. Bergsträsser, *Einführung in die Semitischen Sprachen* (1928) 23.

¹¹ The most recent translation of the Hammurabi Code, that of W. Eilers, (*Der Alte Orient* 31 3/4, 1932), claims to be the first to apply the "Landsbergersche Tempuslehre." The practical result is that the *t*-form is simply translated by the present.

¹² *WZKM* 42 (1935). 1-30. This paper is the first serious attempt to meet the problem.

was misled by certain preconceived notions.¹³ The problem is still unsolved.

General Observations.

The function of the *t*-form can be determined only by interpretation and comparison of relevant occurrences in the texts. The investigation must necessarily be carried on separately for the different periods of the language. Thus, the following remarks will be deliberately limited to the Old Babylonian period. They will exhaust the material presented by the Code of Hammurabi and will supplement it by additional evidence gathered from the letters and the contracts.¹⁴

It should be emphasized from the beginning that the *t*-form is very much alive in the period concerned. Its usage can by no means be explained as a by-product of fashion or style; it is obviously regulated by grammatical reasons. Where linguistics is confronted with a difference of form, it has to assume in principle a corresponding difference of function. There is of course the possibility that in certain phrases obsolete forms persist beside younger ones. Such instances are, as a rule, easily recognizable;

¹³ It is dangerous to apply the comparative method to such a problem from the very beginning. Before comparison can be useful, the facts to be compared must be precisely defined, both as to meaning and as to form. Before publishing his investigations on the *t*-form, Oppenheim applied their results to isolate different sources in both the Code of Hammurabi and the Middle Assyrian Law Book; *WZKM* 40. 181-220; 41. 1-80. [See now also Oppenheim's *Untersuchungen zum Babylonischen Mietrecht, Beihefte, WZKM* 2 (1936). 125 f. (note 19). E. A. S.]

¹⁴ In quotations the following abbreviations have been used: *ABB* = A. Ungnad, *Altbabylonische Briefe aus dem Museum zu Philadelphia* (1920); *BA* = *Beiträge zur Assyriologie*; *BB* = A. Ungnad, *Babylonische Briefe* (1914); *CT* = *Cuneiform Texts from Babylonian Tablets in the British Museum*; *JRL* = *John Rylands Library* (T. Fish, *Bulletin of the JRL Manchester* 16, 506-28; 17, 106-20); *Kraus* = P. Kraus, *Altbabylonische Briefe aus der Vorderasiatischen Abteilung etc.* (*MVAeG* 35, 2 and 36, 1, 1931/2); *LIH* = L. W. King, *Letters and Inscriptions of Hammurabi* (1898/1900); *Meissner* = B. Meissner, *Beiträge zum Altbabylonischen Privatrecht* (1893); *RT* = *Recueil de Travaux*; *Scheil, Sippar* = V. Scheil, *Une Saison de Fouilles à Sippar* (1902); *TCL* = *Musée du Louvre, Département des Antiquités Orientales, Textes Cunéiformes*; *Tell Sifr* = Ch.-F. Jean, *Tell Sifr* (1931); *UMBS* = University of Pennsylvania, University Museum, *Publications of the Babylonian Section*; *VS* = *Vorderasiatische Schriftdenkmäler*; *YOS* = *Yale Oriental Series*.

they never can occupy a prominent place in the grammatical system of a language. The *t*-form does so distinctly; it not only occurs very frequently, but also under definitely marked conditions. Its usage, therefore, must be explained out of the living language itself.

The fact is significant that frequently the verbal form shifts from the *t*-form to the primary one, although the same action is indicated. A characteristic example is this:

²*bār*[*ū* ..] ³..... ⁴*ki-a-am* "The diviners in-
⁵*ú-lam-mi-du-nin-ni um-ma šu-* formed me as follows; this is
⁶*nu-ma eglēti^{bi.a}-ni ši-bi-it-ni* what they said: 'Our fields,
⁷*la-bi-ra-am ša ab-bu-ni i-ku-lu* our old property, of which our
⁸*redūtum ib-ta-aq-ru-ni-a-ti* ancestors had the usufruct—
⁹*ki-a-am ú-lam-mi-du-nin-ni* the *redūs* have claimed them
¹⁰*a-na mi-nim eglētim^{bi.a-tim}* from us.' Thus they informed
¹¹*ši-bi-iz-zu-nu la-bi-ra-am* me. Why did they claim from
¹²*ab-bu-šu-nu i-ku-[lu]* them the fields, their old prop-
¹³*ru-šu-nu-ti wa-ar-ka-tam pu-* erty, of which their ancestors
¹⁴*ur-sa-a-ma eqlam^{am} ši-bi-iz-* had the usufruct? Examine the
¹⁵*zu-nu la-bi-ra-am* case! and let them not claim
¹⁶*qá-ru-šu-nu-ti (TCL VII. 43* from them a field, their old
¹⁷*= RA 21, p. 36).* property!"

In this context the *t*-form apparently is not used to express a modification of the action itself. The forms *ibtaqrū*, *ibqurū* and *ibagqarū* evidently refer to one and the same action. The reason for using different forms must depend on their different position within the above given context.

Other examples from letters are e.g. *LIH 1* (= *BB 35*).13:15 (*aṭṭardam : ša taṭrudāššu*); *LIH 3* (= *BB 36*).7:11 (*umtallū : lā umallū*); *LIH 26* (= *BB 38*).11:18 (*umtalli-šunūti : tumalli*).

The Code also presents such cases; only a few can be selected here:¹⁵

¹⁵ In citing the Code of Hammurabi A. Ungnad's autographed text in "Keilschrifttexte der Gesetze Hammurapis" (Leipzig, 1909) has been used. The quotations are given, however, according to paragraphs, so that they may be controlled also by R. F. Harper's, *The Code of Hammurabi* (Chicago, 1904). For the gap the Nippur tablet *UMBS V. 93*—cf. A. Poebel, *OLZ* 1915. 160 ff.—is to be compared; sections preserved on this tablet only are cited between quotation marks (e.g. § "93").

šum-ma a-wi-lum i-in mār a-wi-lim úḫ-tap-pi-id i-in-šu ú-ḫa-ap-pa-du (§ 196).

šum-ma a-wi-lum e-li a-wi-lim šē'am ù kaspam i-šu-ma i-na ba-lum be-el šē'im i-na na-aš-pa-ki-im ù lu i-na ma-aš-ka-nim šē'am il-te-qī a-wi-lam šu-a-ti i-na ba-lum be-el šē'im i-na na-aš-pa-ki-im ù lu maškanim i-na šē'im li-qṭ-im ú-ka-an-nu-šu-ma šē'am ma-la-a il-qú-ú ú-ta-ar (§ 113).

"Supposing a citizen has destroyed the eye of a(nother) citizen, they will destroy his eye."

"Supposing a citizen had grain or silver outstanding with a(nother) citizen and, without the permission of the owner of the grain, he took grain from the barn or from the threshing floor, they will convict that citizen of having taken grain from the barn or the threshing floor without the permission of the owner of the grain and he will give back all the grain he took."

Here too, the verbal forms *uḫtappidū* and *ilteqī*, both *t*-forms, are replaced later on by the primary forms *uḫappidū* and *legim*, *ilqū*.

What, then, are the reasons for using now the *t*-form and now the primary form?

The evidence can be subsummed under three main heads: A. The *t*-form in the function of a tense in coordinated clauses. B. The *t*-form in the function of a relative tense in subordinated clauses. C. The *t*-form as an aspect. These subdivisions will be treated below in the order just indicated.

A. THE *t*-FORM IN THE FUNCTION OF A TENSE IN COORDINATED CLAUSES

I. It is a recognized fact that the *t*-form regularly concludes a series of successive verbal clauses in the preterit.¹⁶ The different clauses are commonly connected by the particle *-ma* appended to the verbal form.

The numerous *šumma* sentences of the Hammurabi Code are pertinent here. It should be recalled that in Akkadian syntax *šumma* is not treated as a subordinating particle; the *šumma* sen-

¹⁶ Cf. the remarks by Landsberger and Oppenheim in the papers cited above.

tences are always construed as main clauses.¹⁷ They state the facts of the given case to be decided.¹⁸

A first group of examples comprises the relatively few sections where a single clause is sufficient to state the case: §§ 6, 7 (2nd verb),¹⁹ 8, 21, 41,²⁰ 59, 64, "88", 104, 121, 153, 226, 239, 257, 258, 259, 261, 268, 269, 270, 271, 272, 273, 275, 276, 277. In all these sections the verb is in the primary form.

In general the grammatical construction of these clauses is very simple. In addition to the subject and the verbal predicate there are involved:

1. An object: §§ 6, 8, 21, 26, 41,²¹ 239, 257, 258, 259, 268, 269, 270, 271, 272, 273, 275, 276, 277.
2. An object preceded²² by a prepositional phrase: §§ 59, 121, 153, 226.
3. An object followed by a dative of purpose: §§ 7 (end), "88", 104, 261.²³

¹⁷ A. Ungnad, *ZA* 17 (1903). 362 f.

¹⁸ After *šumma* the preterit is usually found. The present (or present-future) appears only on rare occasions. The examples may be listed here:

1. The sentence does not introduce a juridical case and its punishment, but merely gives instructions how a procedure might be performed correctly: §§ 122, 138, 274.

2. The *šumma* sentence contains a reference to the future and is transferred therefore to the future as a whole: § 71 (*ša i-ša-am-ni-ū* "which he wants to buy"), § 172 (*aš-šum i-na bitim šu-še-im* "in order to cause her to abandon the house"). In §§ 117/8 the dative of purpose *a-na ki-iš-ša(-a)-tim* (see P. Koschaker, *Neue Rechtsurkunden aus der El-Amarna-Zeit*, 90 f., and *ibid.*, 63 note 4) is perhaps equivalent to a similar expression.

3. The *šumma* sentence is of a different nature. It forms part of the apodosis of the main *šumma* sentence and introduces an alternative verdict: § 129 ("supposing the woman's husband will allow the woman to live, the king will allow also his servant to live").

¹⁹ The conjunction *ū* *ū* marks a new beginning.

²⁰ The parallel verbs connected by *ū*.

²¹ The object is composite in this case.

²² It is essential that the close relation between the verb and its object, as indicated by their juxtaposition, be not disrupted. As soon as the prepositional phrase is inserted between them, the *t*-form is required: §§ 9, 16, 57, 109; also the second accusative governed by *šūšum* seems to have the value of a preposition with following noun: § 15. Only § 259 offers an exception.

²³ Here consisting of an infinitive with preceding objects.

4. A direct object followed by an indirect one and a dative of purpose: § 64.

A second group consists of longer clauses with various other additional elements; the verb is transferred in consequence to the *t*-form. In detail there are found:

1. Infinitives after *ina*: §§ 103, 129, 211; ²⁴ after *ana*: §§ 137, 141, 144, 145, 148, 168, 172, 177; ²⁵ after *aššum*: § 151.²⁶
2. Inserted relative sentences belonging to the subject: §§ 110,²⁷ 159, 264; ²⁸ or to the object: § 190.
3. An adjective belonging to the object: § 14.²⁹
4. A genitive belonging to the object: §§ 33, 196, 197, 198, 199, 200, 201, 202,³⁰ 203,³⁰ 204, 205, 221, 280. The genitive may even be contained in a pronominal suffix: §§ 154, 195.
5. A prepositional phrase between object and verb: §§ 7,³¹ 9,³² 16,³³ 35, 108,³⁴ 206,³⁵ 241. Cf. also § 109.³⁶

The reason of the shift seems to be that the additional elements are equivalent to a full sentence, so that, in a sense, the verb is preceded by what amounts to another verbal form.

For, as soon as the *šumma* sentence contains two verbs, the first verb is regularly in the primary form, but the second in the *t*-form. If the primary form is denoted by 1, the *t*-form by 2, the usual construction will be as follows: 1-*ma* 2.³⁷ Examples are: §§ 2, 3, 17, 22, 27, 42, 43, 48,³⁸ 56, 58, 65, "78", "91", 106, 113, 114, 119, 120 (twice), 123, 124, 125, 127, 133 b, 142, 175, 179, 185, 188, 209, 213, 219, 220, 224, 225, 227, 238, 240, 244, 245, 250, 254, 267, 279.

²⁴ A comparison with § 209 is particularly instructive. Apparently the infinitive *ina maḥāsim* is equivalent to the finite form *imḥaš-ma*.

²⁵ The infinitive after *ana* denotes an intention.

²⁶ Therefore afterwards (cf. note 33) 2-*ma* 2; for the use of the numeral here and below cf. note 8.

²⁷ 2 *ū* *lū* 2.

²⁸ 2 — 2 — 2.

²⁹ Cf. §§ 6, 8 (*išriq*).

³⁰ Here the genitive is supplemented by a relative sentence. Cf. however § 204.

³¹ Note the abnormal 2 *ū* *lū* 1.

³² 2 — 2 *ū* 2 — 2 *ū* 2.

³³ 2-*ma* 2.

³⁴ 2 — 2 *ū* 2.

³⁵ 2-*ma* 2.

³⁶ Between subject and the verb in the passive.

³⁷ In this list have been included also such *t*-forms as may be explained on objective grounds (section C).

³⁸ On *ibašši* (present) see below, p. 317.

When two actions or two sets of actions are regarded as equivalent to, or as contemporary with, each other, they may be placed side by side without any connective particle. Accordingly, the following patterns arise:

1 — 1-*ma* 2: §§ 55, 162.

1-*ma* 2 — 2: §§ 107, 126, 148, 194.³⁹

1 — 1-*ma* 2 — 2: § 161.

Alternatives are connected by *ū* or *ū lū* "or", without any change in the general construction:

1 *ū lū* 1-*ma* 2: § 26. 2⁴⁰ *ū lū* 1-*ma* 2: § 33.

1-*ma* 2 *ū lū* 2: § 246; 1-*ma* 2 *ū* 2: § 265.

1-*ma* 2 *ū lū* 2 *ū lū* 2: § 48; 1-*ma* 2⁴¹ — 2 *ū lū* 2: § 248.

1-*ma* 2 *ū lū* 1-*ma* 2: §§ 215, 218.

1 *ū* 1 — 2 — 2: § 170.

In a considerable number of sections three successive actions are involved. This situation results in the following constructions:

1-*ma* 1-*ma* 2: §§ 1, 25, 44, 115, 145, 156, 193, 249, 278.

1-*ma* 2-*ma* 2: §§ 130, 233.⁴²

Here again equivalents are added asyndetically and alternatives are introduced by *ū* or *ū lū* "or" which do not affect the construction:

1-*ma* 1-*ma* 2 — 2: §§ 144, 235.

1-*ma* 1-*ma* 2 *ū* 2: § 53.

1-*ma* 1-*ma* 2 *ū lū* 2: § 236.

1-*ma* 1 — 1-*ma* 2 *ū* 2: § 237.

³⁹ In § 163 1-*ma* 1 — 2 is found. The middle form without *t* will be accounted for in section A II.

⁴⁰ The *t*-form is caused by the genitive belonging to the object (cf. above, second group, figure 4). Translate perhaps "soldiers who desert" (literally "soldiers of desertion").

⁴¹ The text of the stela presents *iš-bi-ir*. It must, however, be considered seriously whether *iš-bi-ir* might not be a mistake for the expected *iš-te-bi-ir*. The first half of the Old Babylonian sign *te* resembles to some extent the sign *bi*, so that partial haplography may have been responsible for the present form.

⁴² For *la uš-te-is-bi-ma* cf. below p. 315.—The examples §§ 145, 156, 278 are not included here; the primary form after a negation is probably equivalent to the *t*-form, according to section A II.

Also 2 *inūma* 2-*ma* 2: § 280 may be mentioned here.⁴³

In relatively few cases more than three actions are concerned. The usual means of continuation are also employed here:

1-*ma* 1-*ma* 1-*ma* 2: § 229.

1⁴⁴ -*ma* 1-*ma* 1 — 1-*ma* 1-*ma* 2: § 251.

1-*ma* 1 — 2⁴⁵ — 2-*ma* 2: § 167.

Longer sentences may be subdivided, however, by means of adverbs, or by the repetition of *šumma*. The adverb *warka* "afterwards" is used in the following examples:

1-*ma* 2 *warka* 2 *ū lū* 2: § 45.

1 *warka* 2-*ma* 2: § 191.⁴⁶

Almost synonymous is *ina warka* "later on":

1-*ma* 1⁴⁷ — 2-*ma* 2 *ina warka* 2-*ma* 2: § 135.

Similar is also *warkānum* "subsequently":

1 — 1 — 1 *warkānum*-*ma* 2: § 5.

1-*ma* 1-*ma* 1 — 1 *warkānum*-*ma* 2: § 176.

1-*ma* 1-*ma* 2 *warkānum* 2: § 146.

1-*ma* 1⁴⁸ *warkānum*-*ma* 2-*ma* 2: § 155.

The conjunction *šumma*, meaning in these circumstances "and supposing then" (German "und wenn dann"), appears in the following examples:

1-*ma* 1 — 1⁴⁹ *šumma* 2: § 49.

1-*ma* 1 — 1 — 1 — 1 *šumma* 1-*ma* 2: § 253.

1-*ma* 2 *šumma* 1: ⁴⁹ § 32.

1-*ma* 2 — 1-*ma* 2 *šumma* 2-*ma* 1: ⁵⁰ § 30.

1-*ma* 2 — 2 *šumma* 2-*ma* 2: ⁵¹ § 136.

⁴³ *inūma* is here an adverb, as the syntax shows.

⁴⁴ The first sentence is nominal.

⁴⁵ *ana šimtim ittalak*, cf. below p. 322.

⁴⁶ The use of the adverb after the first verb seems to be due to the fact that the first part of the sentence is amplified by a relative sentence containing two verbs.

⁴⁷ The form is *ibašši* (present); cf. below, section A III.

⁴⁸ The form contains a pronominal suffix; cf. below, section A IV.

⁴⁹ The form is *ibašši*; cf. below, section A III.

⁵⁰ The form is *irriš*; cf. below, section A III.

⁵¹ Here *iššabat* seems to be present; the *t*-form, therefore, must be taken as objective; cf. below, section B.

In those verbal chains which contain more than two links the *t*-form may be introduced in one of the middle links. The use or non-use of the *t*-form seems to affect the sense of the whole sentence only to a very slight degree.

In the last-quoted instances only those cases have been included where the second *šumma* is not preceded by any apodosis. There remain to be treated certain sections beginning with *šumma*, which continue, in one sense or another, a preceding section that has been terminated by a regular apodosis. The following varieties of cases with continuing *šumma* may be distinguished:

1. The "varied case": It adds some new circumstances to those given before; this *šumma* will best be translated by "supposing then, furthermore" or "but supposing" (German "und wenn dann, ferner; wenn aber"):

2: §§ 2 (middle part), 12, 18, 20, 47, 52, 100,⁵² 207, 210, 212, 214, 263.

2-*ma* 2: §§ 2 (end), 105, 178.

2 *warka* 2: § 173.

2. The "counter-case": It deals with the converse of the preceding case; its *šumma* will best be translated by "supposing on the other hand" (German "wenn dagegen"):

2: §§ 11, 23, 37,⁵³ 46, 101, 105, 116, 118, 141 (end), 149, 152, 164, 169, 174, 189, 230, 231, 232.

2 — 2: § 10.

2 *a la* 2: § 266.

2-*ma* 2: §§ 31, 102,⁵⁴ 132.

2 *warka* 2: §§ 19, 173.

As can be seen from the evidence quoted, all verbal forms in such sentences are *t*-forms.⁵⁵

If indeed, as stated above, the *t*-form concludes series of verbal clauses which are commonly connected by the particle *-ma*, the question arises whether or not the *t*-form is reconcilable with this particle.

⁵² The preceding section is preserved in UMBS V. 93.

⁵³ This case is a special one, because the preceding section (§ 36) contains a prohibition, not the usual *šumma* sentence.

⁵⁴ The first *t*-form may be explained here as objective; cf. below, p. 319 ff.

⁵⁵ Exceptions will be explained below, sections A II to V.

An examination of the Code shows that *-ma* actually occurs after *t*-forms. Three occurrences merit particular attention:

šum-ma aš-ša-at a-wi-lim ša i-na biṭ a-wi-lim wa-aš-ba-at a-na wa-še-im pa-ni-ša iš-ta-lea-an-ma zi-ki-il-tam i-za-ak-ki-il bi-za ú-za-ap-pa-aḥ mu-za ú-ša-am-ṭa . . . (§ 141).

"Supposing a citizen's wife who has been living in his house resolves to leave and (for this purpose) embezzles the house-keeping money, neglects her house, disgraces her husband . . .".

šum-ma it-tu-ra-am-ma eḡel-šu kirā-šu ù bi-zu i-ir-ri-iš . . . (§ 30).

"and supposing he has come back and demands his field, his garden and his house . . .".

šum-ma a-wi-lum šu-ú it-tu-ra-am-ma aš-ša-zu iṣ-ša-ba-at (§ 136).

"and supposing this citizen has come back and proceeds to take his wife".

In these three occurrences alone the action recorded is subsequent to that expressed by the *t*-form. Characteristically enough the tense used is the present-future.

In all other occurrences of a *t*-form with *-ma* a second *t*-form follows; the actions concerned are considered as contemporaneous, as different consequences of identical facts. The elements which connect the two actions may be recorded as follows:

"accordingly": §§ 2, 27, 105, 135, 159, 178, 191, 233.

"consequently": §§ 135, 167, 206.

"in so doing": §§ 130, 155.

"but":⁵⁶ §§ 16, 31, 57, 109.

If, then, the particle *-ma* has one of these meanings, it is well reconcilable with the *t*-form. When placed, however, after this form, it never has the meaning "and subsequently, afterwards."

The evidence of the Code may be supplemented by a particularly significant usage in the letters. The *t*-form is very frequently preceded by the adverbs *anumma* or *inanna*. The rôle of *anumma* is very clearly shown in the following passage:

⁵⁶ This connotation depends rather on the negation which accompanies one of the two verbs (§§ 16, 57, 109) or the negative meaning of the verb itself (§ 31).

⁸ša-ad-da-ag-di-im rakbu^{meš}
 awēl qaštim ⁴a-na eqlētim^{bi.a}
 šu-uš-bu-tim ⁵aṭ-ru-da-ak-kum
⁶warhi ⁸kam ma-aḥ-ri-ku-nu uš-
 bu-ma ⁷1 awēlam ú-ul ta-pu-
 la ⁸a-at-tam i-na Sippar^{ki}
⁹wardū^{meš} ka-lu-šu-nu uš-bu
¹⁰ū at-tu-nu ta-az-zi-za-ma ¹¹a-
 wi-li-e ša a-na eqlimtm ša-ba-
 tim ¹²i-ri-id-du-ú ¹³a-na eqlim
 ša-ba-tim ú-ki-in-nu ¹⁴ša a-na
 eqlim ša-ba-tim ¹⁵la i-ri-id-du-ú
¹⁶a-na eprim te-si-ḥa ¹⁷.....
²⁰a-nu-um-ma rakbu^{meš} ša eqlam
 i-ša-ab-ba-tu ²¹..... ²³a-
 na ma-aḥ-ri-ku-nu aṭ-tar-dam
²⁴a-na pi i-si-iḥ-tim ša uk-ti-
 in-nu-šu-nu-ši-im ²⁵eqlam^{am} šu-
 uš-bi-ta-šu-nu-ti (TCL VII. 11
 = RA 211, p. 11 f.).

"Last year, I sent you the
 rakbus of the archer so that
 they might receive fields. Eight
 months they stayed before you;
 but you did not satisfy one
 (single) man.

This year, all the servants
 stayed at Sippar. And you re-
 mained inactive; and, there-
 fore, those people who are in
 line to receive a field they ap-
 pointed to receive a field. Those
 who are not in line to receive
 a field, you shall have to sup-
 port.

And now, I have send before
 you the rakbus who should re-
 ceive a field. According to the
 tenor of the documents which
 one has granted to them, let
 them receive a field!"

The above passage consists of three different parts which are sharply separated from each other by means of adverbs. The first two parts, beginning with "last year" and "this year" respectively, report on what happened in the past. They give an account which is without immediate significance. Grammatically, the verbal forms are exclusively derived from *t*-less stems. The third part, however, introduced by "and now," turns to the actual business, for which the preceding facts have merely been an introduction; it states the resultant measures. This is no longer a narration, it is an announcement.

As a matter of fact, sentences beginning with *anumma* contain regularly a *t*-form. Examples are so numerous that it is sufficient to refer to the frequently repeated sentences *anumma X aṭṭar-dak-kum* "and now, I have sent to you X" and *anumma X tuppi uštabilak-kum* "and now, I caused X to bring you my letter."

When two verbs are involved, the construction, as before, presents the combination:

- 1-*ma* 2: *BT* XVI. 189 (= *BB* 214). 15 ff.; *LIH* 9 (= *BB* 9). 11 ff.; 15 (= *BB* 55). 4 ff.; *OE* III. 8. 4 ff.; 25. 6 ff.; 80. 2 f.; *TCL* VII. 9. 10 f.; 41. 12 ff.; 51. 14 ff.;⁵⁷ *TCL* XVII. 63. 5 ff. (with *anumma*).⁵⁸
CT VI. 27 b (= *BB* 229). 20 ff.; *VS* VII. 203 (= *BB* 260). 22 ff.;⁵⁹ *LTC* VII. 68. 18 ff. (with *inanna*).

The meaning of this *anumma* is not merely temporal. It points to preceding events and indicates that the action which is now introduced was influenced by, and resulted from, these preceding events or actions. The very closely related *inanna* seems more to emphasize the temporal element.⁶⁰ Both adverbs may open the letter; the preliminaries are then omitted, because the assumption is that they are familiar to both the writer and the addressee.

There are also cases where the first sentence of a letter contains a *t*-form without a preceding adverb. In such sentences no preliminaries are touched upon. E. g.:

- | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>⁵⁷<i>aš-šum Mu-ḫa-di-tim</i> ⁵⁸<i>tup-pa-am X 'Y</i> ⁵⁹<i>uš-ta-bi-lam</i> (<i>CT</i> VI. 23 a = <i>BB</i> 109).
 ⁶⁰<i>pī-tum ša Bi-na-a^{ki} it-te-is-ki-ir</i> ⁶¹<i>mu-ú a-na nār Edin-na gu-um-mu-ru</i> (<i>TCL</i> VII. 19 = <i>RA</i> 21, p. 18).</p> | <p>"concerning Muḫadditum, I have caused X, Y and Z to bring you a letter."
 "the breach (in the embankment) of Bina has been repaired. The water has completely been returned to the Edinna canal".</p> |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

Such abbreviated statements may convey the idea of urgent, surprising or even alarming news.⁶¹

Here once more the combination 1-*ma* 2 is possible:

⁵⁷ In l. 16 read probably *uš-ta-bi-la-ak-kum*.

⁵⁸ As to the combination *uwa'eram-ma aṭṭardam* which is found in most of these passages, it must be said that the terminative *uwa'eram* is attracted by *aṭṭardam*; cf. B. Landsberger, *ZA* NF 1. 116.

⁵⁹ The first verb, in this case, is made up itself from two asyndetic verbs: *u-ta-ak-ki-il ap-ru-us* "I investigated throughout." Cf. the passages listed in Ungnad's *Babylonische Briefe* p. 400.

⁶⁰ The virtually analogous *innan(n)u* acts as a temporal conjunction; cf. von Soden, *ZA* NF 7. 148.—Cf. L. Oppenheim, *WZKM* 42. 7 f.

⁶¹ Sometimes, in quotations from previous letters, only the last part with the *t*-form is given as the most significant one.

¹³ša ta-aš-pu-ra-am ¹⁴a-na X ù "what you wrote me, on X
Y ¹⁵ú-da-an-ni-nam-ma aš-tap- and Y I impressed it strongly
ra-am ⁶² (TCL VII. 19 = RA and have written it (to them)"
21, p. 18).

¹³⁵ ŠE.GUR 2. ³a-na X "with 35 gur of barley
⁴e-ri-ib-ma ⁵am-ta-da-ad (VS I reimbursed X and have meas-
XVI. 187 = Kraus II. p. 61). ured (it) out".

Not every letter necessarily contains such distinct announcements. But wherever past actions are related, they culminate in a *t*-form:

¹²⁵ šiqḫi kaspam an-ni-ki-a-am "Here I discovered 5 shekel of
¹⁸a-mu-ur-ma aš-ta-qá-al (VS silver (that they were credited)
XVI. 48 = Kraus I. p. 29). and have paid (them)".

³³ki-a-am iq-bi-a-am-ma ³⁴li-ib- "Thus he spoke to me and I
bi i-ri-im-šu-ma ³⁵uš-te-ši-šu took pity on him and have
(TCL I. 29 = BB 143). released him".

⁴X ⁵wa-ar-ki tap-pi- "X was later than
e-šu ⁶ú-ḫi-ra-am-ma ⁷i-na qá-ti his companions and from the
šú-ḫa-ri-im ⁸. 1 nūnam hand of the assistant
el-qí-e-ma ⁹iš-ba-tu-šu-ma ¹⁰ik- he received 1 fish, but they
ta-lu-šu (CT IV. 27 d = BB seized him and detained him".
156).

It can be seen even from the foregoing evidence that the *t*-form appears to have a distinct place within the tense system of Akkadian. Any attempt to determine this place more exactly has to take into particular consideration the relationship of the *t*-form to the other tenses. It has already been said, that this form terminates series of simple preterits (p. 302 ff.) and may be followed by forms of the present-future (p. 308). It shows, furthermore, some affinity with the permansive. For the *t*-form immediately before the permansive compare, e. g.:

³n[ār X] ka-lu-ša it-te-eḫ-ri "The whole X canal has been
⁴nār Y ú-ul ḫi-ri-a-at-ma (LIH dug, (but) the Y canal has
5 = BB 44). not (yet) been dug out."

⁶⁵ SAR kiḡallam ⁷it- "He took away ⁶⁸ 5 SAR

⁶² The terminative *udanninam* is due once more to attraction; cf. p. 310, note 58.

⁶⁸ Cf. below section C.

ba-al-ma i-te-pu-uš ⁸*šú-ḫa-ar-šu* building-lot and has built (on it); his assistant for x years
 MU x.KAM ⁹*i-na li-ib-bi a-ši-* it) ; his assistant for x years
ib (CT VI. 27 b = BB 229). has been living there ”.

And for the *t*-form immediately after a permansive:

²⁰*bi-ri-ku* ²¹*ù ku-zu* ²²*iq-ta-du-* “ I am hungry and the cold has
ni-ni (TCL I. 23 = BB 129). weakened me ”.
⁵*ki-ma iš-tu ma-aḫ-ri-ki* ⁶*ú-šú-* “ When I came from before
a-am a-ḫi a-wi-lim ⁷*mi-it-ma* you, the principal’s brother was
a-na X ⁸*uš-te-ir-di* (VS XVI. dead and, therefore, I have
 2 = Kraus II. p. 99). moved to (the city of) X ”.

Instances of *t*-forms in parallelism to nominal sentences are of the same nature:

⁴*X* ⁵*ù Y* ⁶*maḫ-ri-ku-nu* “ X and Y (are) before you ”
 and
¹²*ù a-nu-um-ma Z* ¹³*ú-wa-e-ra-* “ and now I have ordered and
am-ma ¹⁴*aṭ-ṭar-dam* (TCL VII. sent Z ”.
 41 = RA 21, p. 34).
¹¹*šum-ma ki-sa-am il-qí-ma* ¹²*it-* “ whether he took the purse
ta-la-ak šum-ma ma-aḫ-ri-ku- and has gone, or is before
[nu] (CT XXIX. 33 = BB you ”.
 131).

On the basis of all this evidence, the assumption is justified that it is the function of the *t*-form—or at least one of its functions—to link the past to the present; that it denotes the action which has just been performed and still affects the situation. The best rendering, then, is (wherever possible) by the English perfect “ someone has done something,” “ something has happened,” “ something has been done.” By this translation the *t*-form is kept apart from the primary preterit which contains a mere statement and refers to an action as a past fact: “ somebody did something.” It is differentiated also from the permansive which denotes a state or condition without indicating any connection with previous actions: “ someone or something is in such and such a state.” ^{63a}

The foregoing discussion has deliberately simplified the problem

^{63a} Unfortunately, English usage does not always sanction such formal differentiation in a strict agreement with Akkadian; but occasional departures of this kind will not, it is hoped, distract the reader unduly.

by a seeming disregard of contradictory examples. These "exceptions" must now be grouped, in order to show that they constitute departures which are consistent within themselves. The general statement given under I must be supplemented by three additional observations presented under II, III, and IV.

II. The use or non-use of the *t*-form in some cases depends on whether or not the verb is combined with a negation. The clearest instances from the Hammurabi Code are the following:

*šum-ma a-wi-lum nad̄t̄tam i-ḫu-
uz-ma amtam a-na mu-ti-ša
id-di-in-ma mār̄^{mes} it-ta-la-ad*
(§ 146).

"Supposing a citizen had married a *nad̄t̄tum* and she gave her maid-servant to her husband and she has born children "

as against:

šum-ma mār̄^{mes} la ú-li-id
(§ 147).

"Supposing, however, she did not bear children."

*šum-ma ar-nam kab-tam ša
i-na ap-lu-tim na-sa-ḫi-im a-na
a-bi-šu it-ba-lam* (§ 169).

"Supposing, however, he (i. e. the son) has committed against his father a grave offense, sufficient to remove him from sonship "

compared with:

*šum-ma mār̄um ar-nam kab-
tam ša i-na ap-lu-tim na-sa-ḫi-
im la ub-lam* (§ 168).

"Supposing the son did not commit a grave offense, sufficient to remove him from sonship."

*i-na ṭup-pi-im ša iš-ṭú-ru-ši-
im wa-ar-ka-za e-ma e-li-ša ṭa-
bu na-da-nam iš-ṭur-ši-im-ma
ma-la li-ib-bi-ša uš-tam-zi-ši*
(§ 179).

"(Supposing) in the document which he had written for her he granted her the right of giving her property to whomsoever she pleases and has put at her disposal whatsoever she might choose "

compared with:

*i-na ṭup-pi-im ša iš-ṭú-ru-ši-im
wa-ar-ka-za e-ma e-li-ša ṭa-bu
na-da-nam la iš-ṭur-ši-im-ma*

"(Supposing) in the document which he had written for her he did not grant her the right

ma-la li-ib-bi-ša la ú-ša-am-zī-ši of giving her property to
(§ 178). whomsoever she pleases and
did not put at her disposal
whatsoever she might choose."

Finally, but not so closely parallel:

a-na be-lī-šu ir-te-di-a-aš-šu "(Supposing) he has brought
(§ 17). him (i. e. the fugitive) back
to his master"

as against:

a-na ēkallim la ir-di-a-am "(Supposing) she did not bring
(§ 109). (them, i. e., the outlaws) to the
palace."

The problem is not so simple, however, as to justify the unqualified assertion that every negation requires the use of the simple form instead of an expected *t*-form. There are actually instances of *t*-forms after a negation; e. g., with a form of *wabālum* that occurred in one of the above cited passages:

šum-ma ša-a-a-ma-nu-um na- "Supposing the purchaser has
di-in id-di-nu-šum ù ši-bi ša not produced the seller who
i-na mah-ri-šu-nu i-ša-mu la sold (it) to him and the wit-
it-ba-lam be-el hu-ul-qī-im-ma nesses in whose presence he
ši-bi mu-di hu-ul-qī-šu it-ba- purchased (it); but the owner
lam (§ 10); cf. § 11. of the lost property has pro-
duced witnesses who identify
the lost property."

It would be suggestive to explain the difference by a two-fold meaning of the negation. The negation may express the non-performance of an action, i. e. state a negative fact ("fail to do something"). This is the case in the first four examples. On the other hand, it may indicate the negative effect of an action which has been performed without success ("prove unable to do something"). This is the case in the latter example.

This difference seems to account for several additional passages. For non-performance see §§ 26 (*la il-li-ik*), 62 (*la iz-ku-up*), "93" (*la iš-tū-ur*), 109 (*la ir-di-a-am*), 128 (*la iš-ku-un*);⁶⁴

⁶⁴ The negative expression denotes an action which should properly have been placed before the preceding verb, had it actually been performed. It

131 (*la iṣ-ša-bi-it*).⁶⁵ Furthermore, in §§ 145, 156 and 278 the primary form with the negation occurs between another primary form and a *t*-form; it is impossible, however, to decide whether without the negation the succession 1-*ma* 1-*ma* 2 or 1-*ma* 2-*ma* 2 would be legitimate.⁶⁶

For negative effect see §§ 1, 2, 3 and 127 (*la uk-ti-in*), 132 (*la it-ta-aš-ba-at*),⁶⁷ 42 and 255 (*la uš-tab-ši*),⁶⁸ 109 (*la iṣ-ša-ab-tam*),⁶⁹ 178 (*la ut-ṭi-ib-bu*), 233 (*la uš-te-is-bi*).⁷⁰

The *t*-form of the "counter-case" (cf. above, p. 000) is not influenced by the presence of the negation: §§ 23 (*la it-ta-aš-ba-at*), 46 (*la im-ta-ḫar*), 174 (*la it-ta-la-ad*), 189 (*la uš-ta-ḫi-zu*). In all these cases the corresponding positive *t*-form precedes.

Principally, the same conditions obtain in the letters. It has been shown before (p. 308 ff) that in the letters the main announcement is given in the *t*-form. If it is negative, however, it appears in the primary form:

ʾaš-šum šipāt enzīm ne-me-it- ti-šu ʾa-na Bābīl^{ki} ʾšu-bu-li im "About sending the wool of the goats, his tax, to Babylon

may be translated: "Supposing a citizen took a wife without having made a contract."

⁶⁵ The situation is similar, grammatically, to that of the preceding case: "Supposing the wife of a citizen—her husband accuses her without her being found sleeping with another man."

⁶⁶ For both of them see above, p. 304 ff.

⁶⁷ The difference between § 132 (*lā ittašbat*) and § 131 (*lā iṣṣabit*) is very instructive. In § 131 the negative fact is stressed: the husband has no reason to suspect his wife. In § 132, however, an attempt at catching her is implied. The situation may best be expressed by rendering: "Supposing the wife of a citizen—the finger has been pointed at her because of another man, but it was not possible to seize her sleeping with another man."

⁶⁸ In § 255 probably a ŠE has been omitted erroneously before the verbal form.

⁶⁹ The terminative is caused by the following *ir-di-a-am*. I do not feel that the section has hitherto been interpreted correctly; in my opinion the *ittar-kasū* (nif'al) implies a circumstance which makes the arrest of the outlaws either imperative or more feasible. The negation in *lā iṣṣabtam*, then, means rather "she prevented the arrest." The section indicts the *sabitum* as an accomplice, a fact which accounts for the severe punishment.

⁷⁰ It is not merely accidental that most of these forms are derived from the factitive or the causative. They are more appropriate to express an effect.

- ¹⁰*aš-ta-na-ap-pa-ar-ma* ¹¹*šipāt* I have written repeatedly; but
enzim ne-me-it-ta-šu ¹²*ú-ul ú-* he failed to send the wool of
ša-bi-lam (LIH 55 = BB 82). the goats, his tax."
¹⁰*še-um^{um} ú-ul i-ba-aš-š[i-ma]* "There is no grain; therefore
¹¹*ú-ul id-di-nu-ni-ik-[ki-im]* they did not give you (f.) any."
 (Scheil, *Sippar*, p. 105 = BB
 175).

An instructive alteration between primary and *t*-form is observable in the following passages:

- a-na I-ma-ar-ki* ⁵*gi-ir-ru-um ú-ul* "The journey to Imar did not
im-qú-ut-ma ⁶*ú-ul al-lí-ik* ⁷*a-na* take place. I did not go
Bi-ta-na-ki *uš-ta-ar-di* (CT (there). To Bitana I have
 XXXIII. 22 = BB 147). traveled."
¹⁶*ú-ul ip-pu-šu* ¹⁷*ú-ta-aš-še-* "They do not act; they have
ru ¹⁸*ú 1 šiglum haspum* ¹⁹*mi-* postponed it; no single shekel
im-ma ú-ul šu-ud-du-un (VS of silver was collected."
 XVI. 6 = Kraus I, p. 43).
⁷*be-el-ša ša i-bi-el-lu-ši* ⁸..... "Her master who has control
⁹*an-du-ra-ar-ša ú-ul iš-ku-un* over her he did not
¹⁰*i-na bi-ti-šu ik-ta-la-aš-ši* effect her release, in his house
 (VS XVI. 80 = Kraus I, p. he has held her."
 47).

In numerous cases the *inanna* of the positive phrase is replaced by *adi inanna ul* "not yet"; it is construed exclusively with the primary form. E. g.:

- ¹¹*a-di i-na-an-na ú-ul aš-pu-ra-* "As yet I have not written to
ak-ki (VS XVI. 64 = Kraus you."
 I, p. 18).

The explanation is near at hand: according to the definition given above (section I) the *t*-form implies some extension in time. A negative action, however, cannot have any extension. Therefore, the negation (where it has its full denying force) is incompatible with the *t*-form.

III. There are several verbs which—owing presumably to their specific meaning—do not show the *t*-form where it is expected. At the same time they are in the present instead of in the preterit.

⁷¹ The form is in the present.

First of all *bašūm* "exist" belongs here. E. g.:

šum-ma a-wi-lum šu-ú la-ma sinništam šu-a-ti i-ih-ḫa-zu hu-bu-ul-lum e-li-šu i-ba-aš-ši "Supposing now this citizen is in debt before he takes this woman."

(§ 151).

šum-ma i-na bīti-šu ša pa-ṭa-ri-im i-ba-aš-ši (§ 32). "And supposing there exists (sufficient) ransom in his house."

From the letters:

⁸⁷*aštapirum ḫa-al-qú-um* ⁹*ša X* ¹⁰*i-na Y* ¹¹*i-ba-aš-ši-i* (LIH 89 = BB 69). "The fugitive servants of X.. are in Y."

⁹*a-wi-lu-ú ša ṭá-a-ta-am* ¹⁰*il-qú-ú* ¹¹*ū ši-bu ša a-wa-a-tim ši-na-ti* ¹²*i-du-ú* ¹³*i-ba-aš-šu-ú* (LIH 11 = BB 31). "The people who accepted a bribe and witnesses who know of these things are present."

⁵*mu-ta-a-nu* ⁶*a-nu-um-ma* ⁷*i-na a-li-im* ⁸*i-ba-aš-šu-ú* (CT XXIX. 1 C = BB 97). "A pestilence rages now in the city."

There does not exist a single passage where a *t*-form of *bašūm* might occur. When such a form is considered necessary, grammatically or stylistically, the construction shifts to *šubšūm* "cause to exist"⁷² or to *nabšūm* "be brought to existence."⁷³

Of the same type are *išūm* "have" (§§ 51, "89", "96", 176a; LIH 8. 9; 14. 4); *le'ūm* "be able" (§§ 28, 29, 54, 256; VS XVI. 4. 12); *idūm* "know" (VS XVI. 4. 11); *erēšum* "demand" (§ 30); *ḫiātum* "search" (§ 186).⁷⁴ Perhaps also *ežēbum* "leave (a rest)" (§ 61).

It is their imperfective aspect that ties these verbs together. They denote conditions which remain unchanged, have no recognizable beginning and end. Therefore, they are incapable of expressing an action which has occurred and which influences the present. The exception, then, is merely apparent and confirms the interpretation of the *t*-form which has been given above.

IV. The *t*-form, to a large extent, is irreconcilable with dative

⁷² §§ 42, 49, 52, 144, 255.

⁷³ §§ 43, 120, 152, 266.

⁷⁴ Cf. M. David, *Die Adoption im altbabylonischen Recht* 25 ff.

suffixes. More exactly: when to a third person the suffixes *-šum*, *-šim* etc. are affixed, the *t*-form is replaced by the primary form etc. The fact is most apparent in:

<i>šum-ma a-wi-lum kaspam it-ti</i>	"Supposing a citizen took
<i>tamkarrim il-qí-ma egel ip-še-</i>	money from a <i>tamkarrum</i> , and
<i>tim a-na tamkarrim</i>	gives to the <i>tamkarrum</i> a culti-
<i>id-di-in</i> ⁷⁵	ivated field (and) tells him:
<i>iq-bi-šum</i> (§ 49, cf. § 66),	'.....' " ⁷⁶

as contrasted with:

<i>šum-ma a-wi-lum a-na bit e-</i>	"Supposing a citizen brought
<i>mi-im bi-ib-lam ú-ša-bi-il tir-</i>	a present to the house of his
<i>ha-tam id-di-in-ma a-bi märtim</i>	father-in-law and gave a <i>ter-</i>
<i>mārti ú-ul a-na-ad-di-ik-kum</i>	<i>hatum</i> , but the girl's father
<i>iq-ta-bi</i> (§ 160; cf. §§ 9, 126,	said: 'I shall not give you my
142, 159, 161, 168, 170, 171,	daughter.' "
192, 282).	

Other examples from the Code are: *id-di-iš-ši-im* (§ 172),⁷⁶ *ip-qí-zum* (§ 253), *iš-tur-ši-im* (§§ 182, 183),⁷⁷ *iš-ru-uq-ši-im* (§§ 180, 181, 182,⁷⁸ 183, 184), all of them in positions where *t*-forms are expected. The only exception is *ut-te-ir-šum* (§§ 163, 164) instead of the expected *ú-te-ir-šum*; the question might be raised whether the irregularity arises from the fact that the first radical of the root under discussion is *t*; in pronunciation the two forms must have been almost identical.

In the letters, there is not much opportunity for such combinations, since, for the most part, actions of a third person in their bearing on the writer (1st person) or the addressee (2nd person) are reported.⁷⁹

A noteworthy instance seems to be *aṭ-ru-da-ak-ku-uš* (TCL I. 18 = BB 210 l. 28); the expected *t*-form is avoided probably because of the double suffix which is appended.

⁷⁵ The direct discourse is omitted here.

⁷⁶ The form is preceded by the negation which is sufficient to prevent a *t*-form.

⁷⁷ The first of the two occurrences with negation.

⁷⁸ All three passages contain a negation; the same is true of § 184. The remaining § 183, however, shows a plain *iš-ru-uq-ši-im*.

⁷⁹ Cases like *ú-te-ra-ak-kum* (BA II, p. 573 = BB 169. 16) and *nī-ṭar-da-ak-kum* (CT XXXIII. 20 = BB 171. 19) are merely orthographic.

A few passages must be added, where not the dative suffix, but the accusative suffix seems to have impeded the *t*-form: *ip-ru-uz-zu* (§ "99"), *id-di-iš-ši* (§ 184),⁸⁰ *i-qi-ip-šu* (§ 253),⁸¹ *ú-ra-ak-ki-zu* (§ 253), *ú-ša-bil-šu* (§ 112). But there is a large number of forms where the accusative suffix had no such effect.

An explanation of the fact referred to in this section cannot be offered in the present stage of the discussion, but will be given later.⁸²

V. The observations on the *t*-form as a tense may be supplemented by the statement that it frequently occurs in the imperative, in the prohibitive (its opposite), and in the precative (closely related to both).⁸³ The fact may be exemplified by the following passages:

- ²⁷*nār Purattam ša iš-tu Larsam*^{ki} "The Euphrates from Larsam
²⁸*a-di Urim*^{ki} ²⁹*mi-ig-ti-ša ú-su-* to Ur, its *m.* remove, its *h.*
³⁰*hā-mi-ša šu-ut-bi* ³¹*šu-te-* carry away, and put it in good
³²*še-ir-ši* (*LIH* 4 = *BB* 43). shape!"
¹³*1 qā šē'am* ¹⁰*la tu-uš-ta-* "A single sila of grain . . .
¹⁴*la-pa-at* (*TCL* I. 35 = *BB* let not touch them!"
 192).
¹⁰*bē-ū X li-iš-ta-al* (*CT* IV. "Let my lord ask X."
 19a = *BB* 228).

In this position, the use of the *t*-form is not obligatory. It seems to lay stress on the request or the prohibition. This can easily be accounted for by the aorist-like character of the *t*-preterit. The forms under discussion, when derived from the *t*-form, signify, as it were, that the request is already as good as fulfilled, and thus serve to impart to them greater emphasis.

B. THE *t*-FORM IN THE FUNCTION OF A RELATIVE TENSE IN SUBORDINATED CLAUSES

In dependent clauses the occurrence or non-occurrence of the *t*-form is generally governed by the same rules as in main clauses.

⁸⁰ Here the preceding negation may be responsible.

⁸¹ *ip-qi-zum* intervenes between this and the following form.

⁸² Cf. below, p. 332.

⁸³ This usage of the *t*-form has been emphasized by A. L. Oppenheim, *WZKM* 42. 23, 17 f.

There are, however, some specific conditions limited to subordinate clauses which result in a usage and a meaning of the *t*-form which are not encountered in main clauses.

Rather frequently, especially in letters, the *t*-form is found in a dependent clause of which the corresponding main clause specifies a future event, a request, or a prohibition. In these circumstances, the *t*-form is unmistakably a means of indicating the consecutio temporum and denotes the future perfect. Examples:

a. Future in the main clause:

ša is-ša-ab-tu-ma i-li-il-šu it-ta-al-ku šu-ma i-il-la-ak (§ 30).

"He who will have had (the parcel) and will have fulfilled the feudal obligations (resting on it), that one alone shall continue to do so."

iš-tu mār^{meš}-ša úr-ta-ab-bu-ú zi-it-tam ki-ma ap-lim iš-te-en i-na-ad-di-nu-ši-im-ma (§ 137).

"after she will have raised her children, they shall give her a portion corresponding to that of one son and"

wa-ar-ka a-bu-um a-na ši-im-tim it-ta-al-ku qí-iš-ti a-bu-um id-di-nu-šum i-li-qí-ma (§ 165; cf. §§ 166, 167, 170, 171, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184).

"after the father will have passed away, he shall take the present that the father had given him and"

b. Imperative in the main clause:

²³*ki-ma tup-pí te-eš-te-mu-ú*

"As soon as you will have heard my letter, give quickly 10 shekels of silver."

²⁴*10 šiql^h kaspam ar-ḫi-iš i-di-in* (CT XXIX. 31 = BB 204).

"When they will have reached you, with the troupes under your command make contact with the (additional) troupes and"

⁸*i-nu-ma is-sa-an-ku-ni-ik-kum*

⁹*i-na ummānim^{im} ša qá-ti-ka*

¹⁰*ummānam^{am} lu-pu-ut-ma*

..... (LIH 45 = BB 3).

¹⁷*iš-tu nāram šu-a-ti te-eḫ-te-*

ru-ú ¹⁸*ši-ip-ra-am ša aš-pu-ra-*

kum ¹⁹*[e]-pu-uš* (LIH 5 = BB

44).

"after you will have dug that canal, do the work about which I wrote you."

c. Precative in the main clause:

am-ta ki-ma ²⁹*ta-ta-ap-la-si* "As soon as you will have seen
³⁰*ma-aš-ka-nam lu-na-di* (CT the maid-servant,")
 XXIX. 83 = BB 131).

d. Prohibitive in the main clause:

šum-ma a-wa-tum ¹⁶*la im-ta* "if the matter will not have
ag-ra-ka ¹⁷*a-di a-la-kam še'am* pleased you, let him not touch
mišil qī ¹⁸*la i-la-pa-at* (TCL I. (even) a half sila until I
 27 = BB 157). arrive."

Another set of occurrences is in dependent clauses which precede a main clause in the preterit. Here too the *t*-form expresses the *consecutio temporum*; this time however, owing to the following preterit, it assumes the force of a past perfect. Examples:

šum-ma iš-tu šēnī i-na ugarim "Supposing a herdsman drove
i-te-li-a-nim ka-an-nu ga-ma- the sheep into the fields and
ar-tim i-na abullim it-ta-aḫ- has pastured the sheep in a
la-lu re'ūm šēnī a-na eqlim id- field, after the sheep had gone
di-ma eqlam šēnī uš-ta-ki-il home from the fields and a
 (§ 58). *k. g.*⁸⁴ had been displayed from
 the gate

⁶*i-nu-ma egel-ši-na* "When I had bestowed
⁷..... *um-ta-al-lu-ū* ⁸*a-n[a-* a field on them (f.), I did not
k]u ū-ul wa-aš-ba-ku (CT stay any longer."
 XXIX. 27 = BB 211).

²¹*iš-tu da-ba-bu šu-ū i-na pu-* "After this dispute had been
ūḫ-ri ub-ti-ir-ru ²²*a-na bit* ²³*Ia-* argued out in the assembly,
ab-li-ia a-na bu-ūr-ri il-qū-šu- they took them to the temple
nu-ti (CT IV. 1 = BB 238). of Y. to administer the oath."

To sum up, it can be stated, that the *t*-form as a means of denoting the *consecutio temporum* refers to the action which, seen from the speaker's point of view, has just been performed and is still of actual interest. If the main sentence is in the past (preterit), the *t*-form denotes the past perfect; if, on the other hand, it is in the future, the future perfect. It is obvious that this accords with the interpretation of the *t*-form as an aorist, as it is given in section A.^{84a}

⁸⁴ For interpretation cf. W. Eilers, *Die Gesetzesstele Chammurabis* 25, note 1.

^{84a} Cf. also A. L. Oppenheim, *WZKM* 42. 21 f.

C. THE *t*-FORM AS AN ASPECT

According to the previous discussions the *t*-form is an aorist-like preterit of the basic verb. It is used, then, as a tense and does not modify the action which the verb denotes. This, however, is not the only possible meaning of the *t*-form. Two facts have been disregarded so far: (1) that also present forms with inserted *t* exist; (2) that *t*-forms frequently show a specialized meaning of the given verb. The two facts lead to the conclusion that the *t*-form may also have an objective value.

The Code of Hammurabi contains a small number of present forms with inserted *t*. They may be listed here.⁸⁵

i-te-el-li §§ 36, 37, "70," 113, 116, 177.

it-ta-al-la-ak §§ 142, 149, 191 (twice).

i-tab-ba-al §§ 2 (twice), 26, 41, 159.

ú-ta-aš-šar §§ 20, 103, 130, 227, 249.

uš-ta-ma-aḥ-ḥa-ar § 145.

it-ta-an-di-in §§ 117, 118.⁸⁶

Such presents have also corresponding preterits which must be kept apart from the much more numerous aorists with *t*.

In the Code occur:

it-ta-la-ak § 193; cf. also the frequent occurrences of the phrase *a-na ši-im-tim it-ta-la-ak* §§ 12, 162, 163, 167, 179 or *it-ta-al-ku* §§ 165, 166, 167, 170, 171, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184.⁸⁷

it-ba-al §§ 45, 48, 112.

uš-ta-tam-ḫi-ir § 146.⁸⁸

⁸⁵ Except for the two last-named forms, all occurrences are in the apodosis.

⁸⁶ Formally these forms are characterized as presents by the doubling of their middle radicals. In *ittandin* the doubling is replaced by nasalization, as is usual in Babylonian. The lack of doubling renders it doubtful whether *iš-ša-ba-at* in § 136 can also be listed here. As a matter of fact, Ungnad, *Hammurabis Gesetz* II, p. 160, takes it as a future; but in that case *iš-ša-ab-ba-at* should have been expected. The context shows that the former husband actually does not get back his wife. Accordingly, only the intention or the attempt can be envisaged.

⁸⁷ The *t*-form in *ilik-šu ittalak* can be taken only as aorist on account of *ilik-šu*.

⁸⁸ Ungnad, *Hammurabis Gesetz* II, 146, considers an emendation to *uš-ta-maḥ-ḫi-ir*; in my opinion *uš-ta-ma-ḫi-ir* would be preferable.

It may happen by chance that only preterital forms are attested. If so, their pertinence is revealed only by the meaning of the form. Such examples are:

iḥ-ta-ba-al "he deprived" § 34.

uṣ-te-še-ir "he guided (on the right path)" epilogue XXVr 38 (cf. prologue V 16; epilogue XXIVr 62, 73; XXVr 38, 77, 87; XXVIIr 17).

il-te-qí "he took away, out" §§ 34 (twice), 105.

im-ta-gar "he (she) agreed" § 57.⁸⁰

ir-te-dí "he sent (him) on a campaign" § 33.

The letters and contracts yield additional material. As examples there may be cited the following present forms:

i-ta-ak-la-an-ni *TCL* I. 25. 5, 16.

il-ta-ba-aš *CT* VI. 40a. 12; *CT* VIII. 15c. 13.

it-ta-aš-šu-ú Meissner 97. 19.

it-ta-az-zi *Tell Sifr* 48. 8.

it-ta-uz-zi *VS* VIII. 73. 20.

According to the character of the documents, preterit forms are much more frequent, but recognizable only by their specialized meaning. E. g.:

warūm I 2 "carry away" (see below, p. 328).

ḫalāqum I 2 "escape" (see below, p. 326).

magārum I 2 "agree" *CT* IV. 47a. 18; VI. 33b. 13; VIII. 6a. 16; *VS* VII. 7. 16; VIII. 11. 6.

maḫārum I 2 "equal" as attested by *mithariš*.

malākum I 2 "think over" *UMBS* VII. 86. 13; 107. 32.

ša'alum I 2 "confer" *VS* XVI. 9. 6; *OE* III. 59. 15.

The attempt at classifying the specialized meaning of these verbs leads to the following two groups:

I. The inserted *t* produces reflexive-reciprocal force which is said to be an inheritance from primitive Semitic. Here belong:

labāšum 1 "dress" 2 "clothe oneself"⁸⁰

šumḫurum 1 "make equal" 2 "make oneself equal, claim equality"

⁸⁰ The negation does not influence the *t*-form, when objective. The combination 2-*ma* 2, furthermore, betrays special conditions.

⁸⁰ In the sense of "providing oneself with clothes."

<i>maḡārum</i>	1 "please"	2 "please one another, make an agreement"
<i>maḡārum</i>	1 "face, approach"	2 "face one another, compete"
<i>malākum</i>	1 "counsel"	2 "deliberate with one another"
<i>ša'alum</i>	1 "ask"	2 "ask one another, confer".

Cf. also noun-formations like *tāḡāzum* "catching one another, fight" (*CH* XXVIIr 93; XXVIIIr 2), *tadmiqtum* "accommodation (loan without interest)" (*CH* Ir 17), *talittum* "begetting each other, offspring" (*CH* XXIIr 56, 58); *tamḡarum* "facing one another, battle" (*CH* XXVIIr 86), *tarbaṣum* "lying down with one another, (sheep-)fold" (*CH* XXIIr 76, 80, 81, 83, 85).

II. Much more frequently the inserted *t* produces the meaning of separation. The term "separative" may be introduced for this aspect. It is significant that all the verbs concerned imply motion. This fact explains their being kept apart from the *t*-forms used as aorist. Verbs of movement are primarily imperfective. Imperfective verbs, however, cannot form aorists (cf. above, section A III). The two different types of *t*-form—aorist on one side, separative on the other—may therefore exist side by side without any danger of confusion.

More accurately, the separative denotes a movement from a fixed point in the direction of an unspecified goal. That means, the separative *ittalak* "he left" is semantically opposite to the terminative *illikam* "he arrived." It may be noted that the latter forms an aorist *ittalkam* "he has arrived."⁹¹ For the verb *alākum*—and analogously for all other verbs of this category—the following scheme of possible forms may be set up:

	imperfective:	terminative:	separative:
pres.-fut.:	<i>illak</i> "goes"	<i>illakam</i> "arrives"	<i>ittalak</i> "leaves"
preterit:	<i>illik</i> "went"	<i>illikam</i> "arrived"	<i>ittalak</i> "left"
aorist:	—	<i>ittalkam</i> "has arrived"	<i>ittalak</i> "has left."

The importance and novelty of this point calls for a more extensive documentation:

alākum:

Imperfective-present: **mārū^{meš} ši-ip-ri ù 'iš-tu*
Bābili^{ki} a-na Sippar Ia-aḡ-ru-rum i-il-la-ku "messengers and

⁹¹ The terminative (ventive), therefore, is not a mood, but an aspect too.

..... will go from Babylon to Sippar Yaḥrurum" (*LIH* 85 = *BB* 76).

Imperfective-preterit: *a-šar il-li-ku* "where he went" (*CH* Ir 8).

⁴*a-na al^{ki} La-ar-sa^{ki} al-li-ik-ma* "I went to the city of Larsa and" (*VS* XVI. 15 = *Kraus* II, p. 19).

Terminative-present: ⁵*ummān UN.īl* ⁸*a-na Sippar^{ki} i-il-la-ku-nim* "bearers will come to Sippar" (*LIH* 104 = *BB* 65).

Terminative-preterit: ²*i-na-an-na mi-lum il-li-kam-ma* "now the flood (has) arrived and" (*LIH* 88 = *BB* 78).

Terminative-aorist: *i-nu-ma i-na li-ib-bu UN it-ta-al-kam-ma* "after he has arrived in his homeland and" (*CH* § 280).

a-na ma-aḥ-ri-ka ⁴it-ta-al-kam "he has arrived with you" (*JRL* 905).

¹⁶*an-nu-um-ma X ¹⁷ū Y a-ḥu-šu ¹⁸it-ta-al-ku-ni-im-ma ¹⁹ša-al-šu-nu-ū-ti* "and now X and Y, his brother, have arrived, so ask them!" (*TCL* XVII. 3).

Separative-present: ²⁴*a-na ra-ma-ni-šu ²⁵i-ta-la-ak* "he may go away on his own errand" (*BE* VI 1. 17).

Separative-preterit: ¹⁸*ki-a-am iq-bi-ma ¹⁹it-ta-la-ak* "thus he spoke and went away" (*LIH* 28 = *BB* 12).

²⁰*te-it-bi-e ta-ta-la-ak-ma* "you arose to go away and" (*JRL* 888).

Separative-aorist: ¹⁸*lubuttum* ¹⁷*ū-ul wa-ši-ib a-na gi-ir-ri-im ¹⁸it-ta-la-ak* "the l. is not present; he has left on a journey" (*JRL* 893).

elūm:

Imperfective-present: ¹⁰*ma-am-ma ū-ul il-li* "nobody will go up" (*TCL* I. 49 = *BB* 232).

Imperfective-preterit: ²⁵*a-di-ni a-na ne-ri-ib-tim ²⁶ū-ul e-li-ma* "I have not gone up as yet to the gates" (*VS* XVI. 22).

Terminative-present: ¹⁰*a-na Bābil^{ki} ta-al-li-a-am* "to Babylon you will come up" (*CT* XXIX. 40 = *BB* 269).

Terminative-preterit: ²¹*i-mi-ru iš-tu li-bu ²²ma-tim i-lu-nim-ma* "the asses came up from the country and" (*CT* XXXIII. 21 = *BB* 213).

Terminative-aorist: *iš-tu šēnū^{hi.a} i-na ugarim i-te-li-a-nim* "after the sheep had gone home from the fields" (*CH* § 58, cf. above, p. 321).

Separative-present: *i-te-el-li* "he forfeits" (passages above, p. 322).

ḫalāqum:⁹²

Present: *wa-ar-ka-at eqlim^{im} ʾalpībi.a ù bi-tim ša i-ḫa-al-li-qú-ma* "the matter of the field, the cattle and the house which go to ruin" (*VS XVI. 179*).

Preterit: *ʾaš-šum ši-iḫ-ḫi-ru-ti-šu-nu ʾša iḫ-li-qú-ma iṣ-ša-ab-tu* "concerning their young helpers who disappeared, but were seized" (*BA II. 579 = BB 116*).

Aorist: *mi-im-mu-šu it-ti mi-im-me-e be-el bitim iḫ-ta-li-iq* "his property has been lost together with the property of the owner of the house" (*CH* § 125).

Separative-present: *ʾa-lu-ú-um iḫ-ta-al-[la-aq]* "will the city escape?" (*UMBS VII. 30*).⁹³

Separative-preterit: *šum-ma wardum i-na qá-at ša-bi-ta-ni-šu iḫ-ta-li-iq* "supposing the servant escaped from the hand of his captor" (*CH* § 20).⁹⁴

Separative-aorist: *i-na di-na-tim ʾX iḫ-ta-li-iq* "X has escaped from the law-suit" (*CT XXIX. 33 = BB 131*).

wabālum:

Imperfective-present: *a-na iš-ti-iš-šu pa-ni-šu ub-ba-lu* "for the first time they shall condone it" (*CH* § 169).

Imperfective-preterit: *ʾa-na ša qá-as-sú ub-lu-ma ʾšēʾam^{am} il-qú-ú* "to the extent to which his hand produced (it), they took grain" (*VS XVI. 173*).

Terminative-present: *ʾšē ù ša-at-ti-ša 2 šu-ši ʾḫaḫlam ʾa-na ma-aḫ-ri-ja ú-ub-ba-lam* "every year, he brings here 120 sticks" (*VS XVI. 157 = Kraus I, p. 70*).

Terminative-preterit: *da-ba-ba-am šu-a-tu ʾa-na X ub-lam* "he secretly informed X of this talk" (*CT IV. 1 = BB 238*).

⁹² The meaning of the verb makes the formation of a terminative impossible.

⁹³ Ungnad's supplementation *iḫ-ta-al-qam* is impossible (see preceding note).

⁹⁴ This *t*-form could be explained as "varied case" (cf. above, p. 307).

Terminative-aorist: *šum-ma ša-a-a-ma-nu-um na-di-in id-di-nu-šum* *la it-ba-lam* "supposing, however, the purchaser has not been able to produce the man who sold to him" (*CH* § 10; cf. also § 169.)

Separative-present: *a-bi mārtim mi-im-ma ša ib-ba-ab-lu-šum i-tab-ba-al* "the girl's father will take away (keep) everything that had been brought to him" (*CH* § 159).

¹⁸*a-na da-ba-bi-im-ma ta-at-ta-ab-la-an-ni* "will you carry me off to start a law-suit?" (*UMBS VII. 94*).

Separative-preterit: ⁵*alp^{h1.3}ia awē^lnakrum it-ba-al* "the enemy took my cattle away" (*CT II. 48* = *BB 158*).

Separative-aorist: ¹⁴*šē'am^{am} it-ba-lu* "they have carried away the grain" (*OE III. 16*).

wašūm:

Imperfective-present: *sinnistum ši-i i-na bit mu-ti-ša ú-ul uš-ši* "this woman shall not go out from her husband's house" (*CH* § 172).

¹⁰*wa-ar-ka-tum ip-pa-ra-ús-ma* ¹¹*i-na ša-al-ma-ti nu-uš-ši* "the matter will be investigated and we shall come out all right" (*UMBS VII. 102*).

Imperfective-preterit: ²⁴*iš-tu u₄-mi ša a-bu-ul* ²⁵*Sippar^{ki} ú-šú-ú* "since the day I left the gate of Sippar" (*CT XXIX. 33* = *BB 131*).

Terminative-preterit: *šum-ma a-wi-lum i-na di-nim a-na ši-bu-ut ša-ar-ra-tim ú-ší-a-am-ma* "supposing a citizen appears in court for an untrue testimony and" (*CH* § 3; cf. § 4).

⁵*ki-ma iš-tu ma-aḥ-ri-lai* ⁶*ú-ši-a-am* "when I came here from before you" (*VS XVI. 2* = *Kraus II, p. 99*).

Separative-present: *MU 10^{kam} uš-ša-am-ma* ⁸*it-ta-aš-ši* "for 10 years he will live there and (afterwards) move" (*Tell Sifr, 48*).

¹⁰*i-na bitim ù ú-ni-ti-im* ²⁰*it-ta-uš-ši* "he will be (go) out of (i. e. lose) the house and the furniture" (*VS VII. 73*).

Separative-preterit: ¹¹*šē'um^{um} i-na qá-ti-ia* ¹²*it-ta-ši-ma ú-ul ú-ša-bi-lam* "the grain ran short for me and I could not send any" (*CT IV. 26a* = *BB 173*).

Separative-aorist: ¹¹*šābū^{meš} i-na mu-uh^h-bi-ia* ¹²*it-ta-sú* "work-ers have become scarce with me" (*VS XVI. 10* = *Kraus I, p. 17*; cf. also *VS XVI. 152* = *Kraus II, p. 45*).

warûm:

Terminative-aorist: ⁹*it-ra-am* "he has brought here" (*YOS* II. 109).

²²*a-li-ik at-ra-aš-šu-ú-ma* ²⁸*a-na nu'irrim ni-is-ni-iq* "I went to bring him here, and we set out for the m." (*TOL* I. 29 = *BB* 143).

Separative-preterit: ⁸⁴*sābirēdīmeš* ⁹*it-ru-ma* "he brought away four r.s and" (*CT* XXIX. 22 = *BB* 183).

Separative-aorist: ¹⁵*warabTašritam ūmam* ¹⁶*kam* ^{16is}*eleppam it-ru* "the 16th of Tašritum he brought away the ship" (*BA* V. 4. 43 = Schorr, *Altbab. Rechtsurkunden*, no. 146).

wuššurum: ⁹⁵

Imperfective-present: ³⁹*ša šē'am^m la ub-lam* ⁴⁰*salⁿⁱ-pu-tam ū-wa-aš-ša-ar* "he who has not brought the grain will release his female prisoner for debt?" (*UMBS* VII. 106).

Imperfective-preterit: *ma-an-nu-um ū-wa-še-ir-ku-nu-ti* "who released you?" (*TOL* I. 40 = *BB* 186).

Separative-present: *ni-iš i-lim i-za-kar-ma ū-ta-aš-šar* "he shall take the oath by the god and shall go free" (*CH* § 20); cf. also the passages cited above, p. 322.

Separative-aorist: ¹⁸*ū-ul ip-pu-šu* ¹⁷*ū-ta-aš-še-ru* "(but) they do not do so, they have gone idle" (*VS* XVI. 6 = Kraus I, p. 43).

šūšurum:

Terminative-preterit: ³*i-nu-ma iš-tu Bābīlim^{ki}* ⁴*a-na Ma-aš-ka-an-Am-mi-di-ta-na* ⁵*ū-še-še-ra-am* "when I caused (the way) to be straight from B. to M." i. e. "came straightway from B. to M." (*VS* XVI. 155 = Kraus II, p. 29).

Separative-present: ¹⁸*ū-ul uš-te-eš-še-ru-ni-a-ti* "they do not guide us in the right direction," i. e. "see justice done to us" (*LIH* 92 = *BB* 68).

Separative-preterit: *ū ma-tam uš-te-še-ir* "he guided the country in the right direction" (*CH* XXVr 36 f.).

⁹⁵ The verb is incapable of forming a terminative.

leqūm:

Present: *ša-a-a-ma-nu-um i-na bi-it na-di-na-nim kasap iš-qú-lu i-li-qí* "the purchaser shall obtain from the estate of the seller the money which he paid" (*CH* § 9).

še-ri-iq-ti um-ma-ti-šu-nu i-li-qú "they shall receive the dowry of their (respective) mothers" (*CH* § 167).

Preterit: *šum-ma a-wi-lum kaspam it-ti tamkarrim il-qí-ma* "supposing a citizen received money from the *t*. and" (*CH* § 49).

šum-ma a-wi-lum še-eḫ-ra-am a-na ma-ru-tim il-qí "supposing a citizen took a minor into sonship" (*CH* § 186).

Aorist: *ka-ni-ik kaspim ša a-na tamkarrim id-di-nu la il-te-qí* "and has not obtained a receipt for the money which he gave to the *t*." (*CH* § 105).

¹⁵*i-na-an-na 1/2 ŠAR bītam il-te-qí-šu* "now, the half sar house-plot, he has got it" (*VS* XVI. 126 = Kraus II, p. 90).

Terminative-present: ⁹*tuppātim*^{hi.a} *ma-la ši-bu-ti-ka* ¹⁰*a-la-qí-am-ma a-la-kam* "I shall fetch the tablets, as many as you wish, and shall come" (*CT* II. 10a = *BB* 206).

Terminative-preterit: ²¹*šú-ḫa-ru* ²²*a-na* ¹⁸*kirim ú-ri-da-ma* ²³*e-ši-ir tu-ḫa-la-tim* ²⁴*el-qí-a-am-ma* "the young man descended to the garden and fetched a tenth of the young dates and" (*VS* XVI. 146 = Kraus II, p. 39).

Separative-preterit: *šum-ma lu dēkūm ù lu lubuttūm nu-ma-at rēdim il-te-qí* "supposing the *d*. or the *l*. seize the belongings of a *r*." (*CH* § 34).

⁴¹*še-a-am ma-la i-na Ku-un-nim*^{ki} *il-te-qú-ú* ⁴²[*ù*] *suluppū ù šamaššamum lu ša-at-ra-ma* "the grain—as much as they(?) took away in K.—and the dates and the sesame let them be noted down and" (*TCL* I. 34 = *BB* 191).

Separative-aorist: *nu-ma-at be-el bītim il-te-qí* "and has taken away the belongings of the owner of the house" (*CH* § 25).

¹⁸*aš-šu-mi-šu* ^{subāt}*paršig*^{meš} ¹⁹*ša be-el bīti-šu* ²⁰*X šu-ú* ²¹*il-te-qí-e* "on his behalf, this X has taken away headdresses of the owner of the house" (*UMBS* VII. 113).

nadānum:

Present: ¹⁹šē^{am} i-na Sippar^{ki} ²⁰a-na sabb^{meš} ²¹i-na-ad-di-nu "in Sippar they will give the grain to the wine-sellers" (LIH 85 = BB 76).

ša ka-at-ta-a-am ²ub-ba-la-ak-lum ³kirām ta-na-di-in "you will hand over the garden to that one who will bring you the k." (VS XVI. 78 = Kraus II, p. 43).

Preterit: šum-ma a-wi-lum eqlam ⁴kirām ù bitam ša rēdim bā'irim ù na-ši bi-il-tim ú-pí-īp ù ni-ip-la-tim id-di-in "supposing a citizen (has) bartered a field, garden or house belonging to a r., b., or a person under servitude, has given also a surcharge" (CH § 41).

šum-ma a-wi-lum egel-šu a-na biltim a-na ir-ri-ši-im id-di-in-ma "supposing a citizen (has) handed over his field to a cultivator for a fee " (CH § 45); with the object "field" also §§ 46, 49, 50, 60; with the object "garden" §§ 64, 66.

Terminative-present: ¹⁰[iš-tu] šattim ^{3kam}e-te-ni-ir-ri-iš-šu-ma ¹¹[šē^{am}]^{am} ú-ul i-na-ad-di-nam "for three years I have been constantly asking him, but he does not deliver the grain" (LIH 24 = BB 11).

¹²[x x].IM.MEŠ ša ku-ru-um-ma-ti ¹⁸i-na-an-di-nam "with for food he will supply me" (VS XVI. 140 = Kraus II, p. 103).

Terminative-preterit: ¹⁵še-a-am ú-ul id-di-na-am ¹⁸X še-a-am id-di-na-am "she did not supply me with the grain; X supplied me with the grain" (VS XVI. 106 = Kraus II, p. 12).

Terminative-aorist: ¹⁰MĀ.NI.DUB 3600 GUR suluppī a-na ki-la-li-ni ¹¹šarrum it-ta-ad-na-an-ni-a-ši-im "with a shipload of 3600 Kur dates the king has provided both of us" (VS XVI. 118 = Kraus I, p. 61).

Separative-present: šum-ma a-wi-lum e-ḫi-il-tum iṣ-ba-zu-ma ašša-zu mār-šu ù mār-zu a-na kaspim id-di-in ù lu a-na ki-iš-ša-a-tim it-ta-an-di-in "supposing a citizen—an obligation seized him and he handed over his wife, his son or his daughter for (clearing off) the money (by work), or will even surrender (them) as k." (CH § 117); ⁹⁶ cf. also § 118.

⁹⁶ The distinction between *iddin* here and *ittadin* in § 119, on one hand,

Separative-preterit: *šum-ma lu dēkūm ù lu lubuttām*
rēdām a-na ig-ri-im it-ta-din "supposing a *d.* or a *l.*
 surrendered a *r.* for a fee" (*CH* § 34).

šum-ma alpī^{bi.a} a-wi-lim a-na ig-ri-im it-ta-di-in ù lu zēram
iš-ri-ig-ma i-na eglim la uš-tab-ši "supposing, however, he
 hired out the citizen's cattle for a fee, or he stole the seed
 and did not sow it on the field" (*CH* § 255); cf. § 102.

Separative-aorist: *šum-ma a-wi-lum e-ḫi-il-tum iš-ba-zu-ma*
ama-zu ša mār^{meš} ul-du-šum a-na kaspim it-ta-din "supposing a
 citizen—an obligation seized him and he has sold a maid-servant
 who had borne him children" (*CH* § 119).

šum-ma rēūm ša alpū^{bi.a} ù lu šēnū^{bi.a} a-na ri-im in-na-ad-nu-
šum u-sa-ar-ri-ir-ma ši-im-tam ut-ta-ak-ki-ir ù a-na kaspim
it-ta-di-in "supposing a herdsman to whom cattle and sheep
 have been given to pasture, became unfaithful and has
 changed the cattlemark or has sold (the animals) for
 money" (*CH* § 265).

²⁴*bu-ra-ša ša te-zi-bu* ²⁵*a-na 1 šiqlim kaspim at-ta-din* "the *b.*
 which you left with me, for 1 shekel of silver I have sold
 (it)" (*CT* XXIX. 13 = *BB* 226).

našūm:

Imperfective-present: ⁶*X* ⁴⁵*kussa-ša a-na bit 4Marduk*
¹⁰*i-na-aš-ši-e* "X will carry her chair to the temple of
 Marduk" (Meissner 89).

Imperfective-preterit: *šum-ma a-bu-um nadītam qadištam ù lu*
zērmašītam a-na ilim iš-ši-ma še-ri-ig-tam la iš-ru-uq-ši-im "sup-
 posing a father carried a *n.*, a *q.* or a *z.* to the god and has given
 her no dowry" (*CH* § 181).

Terminative-preterit: *IGI-ka* ²⁵*ilū iš-šu-nim-ma* (*VS*
 XVI. 153 = Kraus II, p. 47).

Separative-present: ¹⁷*ana zittim ki-ma mār^{meš} X* ¹⁸*ù Y iš-te-en*
¹⁹*i-ti-qi-e-ma it-ta-aš-šu-ú* "as his heritage like the children of X
 and Y he will receive one (portion) and they will carry (it) away"
 (Meissner 97).

and *ittandin* here, on the other, is certainly made intentionally. The follow-
 ing words show that § 117 does not imply the sale of members of the
 family; they will be surrendered only temporarily. § 119, however, deals
 with the real sale of a maid-servant.

Separative-preterit: ¹⁹*it-ta-ši* "he carried away" (*TCL* VII. 65 = *RA* 21, p. 48 f.).

redūm:

Imperfective-present: *a-na škalim i-ri-id-di-šu* "he will bring him to the palace" (*CH* § 18).

Imperfective-preterit: ²²*alpi^{hi}.a* ²³*am-mi-ni a-na X ir-du-ú* "why did they drive the cattle to X" (*OE* III. 78).

Terminative-preterit: *šum-ma i-na warhim 6^{kam} ši-bi-šu la ir-di-am* "supposing he did not produce his witnesses within 6 months" (*CH* § 13); cf. § 109.

Terminative-aorist: *šum-ma a-wi-lum lu wardam lu amtam hal-qá-am i-na šé-ri-im iš-ba-at-ma a-na be-li-šu ir-te-di-a-aš-šu* "supposing a citizen (has) seized a fugitive male or female slave in the open country and has driven him to his owner" (*CH* § 17).

Separative-present: probably *te-ir-te-id-di* (*VS* XVI. 149 rev. 4).

Separative-aorist: *ú lu a-na harrān šar-ri-im ^{aw^{el}}agram pu-ḥa-am im-lu-ur-ma ir-te-di* "or (supposing) he accepted for a royal campaign a hired man as a substitute and has sent him out (on the campaign)" (*CH* § 33).

HISTORICAL INTERPRETATION

There remains the question of how the different meanings of the *t*-form, as deduced above from the linguistic evidence, can be genetically understood. In approaching this problem the meanings A (aorist) and B (relative tense) may be treated as identical.

There is no reason to deny that the *t*, prefixed or infixed in primitive Semitic, had primarily a reciprocal-reflexive force; the less so, as traces of this very force are still recognizable in Old Babylonian (and in Akkadian, generally speaking) (cf. section CI). The fact that the action refers to the acting person itself accounts also for the peculiarity (cf. section A IV) that there is at least a tendency to avoid the combination of the *t*-form with a dative suffix (partly even with an accusative suffix) of the personal pronoun.

Also the more frequent meanings of the "separative" and the "aorist" can be explained on this basis.

It is the characteristic of the separative to denote a movement which radiates from a fixed point without any definitely indicated

goal. The action does not necessarily refer to any other person or object, but the moving person or object themselves. Here, then, a link between reflexive and separative seems to be established.⁹⁷ It is, however, doubtful whether such an association of ideas would have led to a productive formation, had it not been favored by other circumstances. As a matter of fact, the development did not take place in any other Semitic language, being characteristic of Akkadian alone. It is known that for certain Akkadian peculiarities the underlying Sumerian language is responsible.⁹⁸ Here too an analogous possibility should be envisaged; particularly so, since the Sumerian verb indicates quite carefully the direction of the action by means of prefixes.⁹⁹ More specifically: In Sumerian the prefixes *m* and *i/e* denote the direction of an action by which an agent affects an object; the prefix *ba*, on the other hand, separates a person or thing from an indicated or understood place. It must be emphasized that the ancient Akkadian scholars regularly rendered Sumerian forms with *ba* by Akkadian *t*-forms.¹⁰⁰ The existence of a "separative" in Sumerian, then, can be held responsible for the widespread use made in Akkadian of a form the formation of which was in accordance with a general trend of development in Akkadian itself.

The *t*-form of the verbs of movement denotes an aspect and exists, accordingly, in various tenses. Its preterit is primarily imperfective. So, for instance, "he went away" originally described a movement which starts from a fixed point. The attention is centered mainly on the movement. As soon, however, as the main interest shifts to the starting-point of the movement, the idea of separating the moved thing from its previous environment be-

⁹⁷ Also in Indo-European the middle voice is quite common with verbs of movement. Cf. K. Brugmann, *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik* II, 3 § 612 (particularly p. 687).

⁹⁸ G. Bergsträsser, *Einführung in die Semitischen Sprachen* 20; B. Landsberger, *ZA* NF 1. 123. Cf. also J. Pedersen, *Reallexikon der Vorgeschichte* 12. 23.

⁹⁹ In this respect, I follow the interpretation of Fr. Thureau-Dangin (*ZA* 20. 395 ff.) which in essential points has been adopted by A. Deimel (*Sumerische Grammatik*, 217 f., 283 ff.), but is opposed by A. Poebel (*Grundzüge der Sumerischen Grammatik*, 213 ff.). The last treatment of the problem is that of Rud. Scholtz, *Die Struktur der Sumerischen engeren Verbalpräfixe* (*MVAeG* 29, 2, 1934).

¹⁰⁰ Cf. A. Poebel, *Sumerische Grammatik* § 598.

comes dominant. The action, in consequence, is transferred from the preterit to the aorist. He who "went away," at the same time, inevitably "has gone." Akkadian *ittalak*, as a matter of fact, unites both meanings. From the verbs of movement the use of this form as an aorist spread afterwards to other verbs, the inserted *t* becoming a convenient means of expressing this tense.

In conclusion, then, it can be stated that the use of the *t*-form in the actual state of Old Babylonian is to a large extent a matter of syntax. In dictionaries the *t*-form should be listed only in such instances as imply a modification of the basic verbal idea.



BRONZE INSCRIPTIONS OF THE WESTERN CHOU DYNASTY AS HISTORICAL DOCUMENTS *

HERRLEE GLESSNER CREEL

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

RELIABLE documents on which to base the history of the Western Chou dynasty (i. e., before 770 B. C.) are very scarce. This is not because written documents were not produced in great numbers at that time. The old theory that books were laboriously scratched with a style and written only on rare occasions after long deliberation is now known to be quite untenable. The Shang¹ oracle bones and the Honan excavations have shown us that the writing brush was already in use² and that books and even letters were by no means uncommon even prior to the Chou dynasty.³ Study of the

* I wish to take this opportunity to express my deep appreciation of the kindness of Mr. Liu Chieh, of the Paleographic Section of the National Library of Peiping. Mr. Liu, who is one of the world's foremost experts on bronze inscriptions, has given the writer the benefit of his encyclopedic knowledge in semi-weekly conferences during nearly two years, all without the slightest reward.

¹ I prefer to call the dynasty which preceded the Chou Shang rather than Yin, because the oracle bones show that its people called themselves Shang, or at least called their city by that name, while the character "Yin" apparently does not occur. Yin seems to have been a Chou name for them. It is true that the book called "Wei Tzū" of the *Shu Ching* represents a Shang officer as speaking of the state as Yin, but this book is a palpable forgery of Chou date, and generally acknowledged as such.

² Cf. Tung Tso-pin, "Chia Ku Wên Tuan Tai Yen Chiu Li," pp. 417-18, and plates opp. p. 418, *Ts'ai Yüan P'ei Sixty-fifth Birthday Anniversary Volume*, Academia Sinica, Peiping, 1933. Three pieces of oracle bone, found *in situ*, written, apparently with a brush, rather than carved, are described and illustrated here. I have also seen a piece of pottery, found in the same excavation, upon which had been written the character 祀 *ss'ü*. The character was quite large. In the opinion of the excavators, and in my opinion, it must have been written with a brush.

In addition to this recent archeological evidence, we find even in the *I Li* reference to writing on silk, which must have been done with a brush and ink of some sort (*I Li*, "Shih San Ching Chu Su," Kianghsi ed. of 1815, 35. 9a; Eng. tr. of John Steele, II, 49).

³ The character 冊 *t'sê* as meaning "book" is frequent on the Shang oracle bones, and in some cases it evidently refers to letters sent from one place to another to give orders concerning military campaigns, etc.

bronze inscriptions, especially when these are compared with the *Shang Shu*, the *I Li*, and the *Kuo Yü*,⁴ shows clearly that documents were produced, even in very early Chou times, with a frequency and a casualness which has scarcely been appreciated. But most of these documents, being incidental to the business of government and of purely temporary value, have been lost.

In addition to these we have divination formulae and poetry. It was the practice of diviners who used the system of the sixty-four hexagrams to make up their own explanations of the hexagrams, for the occasion,⁵ and some of these were put together into the original portions of the *I Ching*; a large part of this material dates from very early in the dynasty, and some of it may even antedate the Chou conquest. Portions of the *Book of Poetry* are known to date from Western Chou times. But this gives us very scanty material, and aside from this we are dependent almost entirely for our knowledge of the period upon such official and quasi-official documents as have survived.

In the transmitted literature these exist almost exclusively in the *Shu Ching* or, as the Chinese more commonly call it, the *Shang Shu*.⁶ But about one-half of this work, the whole of the so-called

This character is found among the earliest bones that we know (Cf. Lo Chên-yü's *Yin Hsü Shu Ch'ü Ch'ien Pien*, 7. 18. 1, where the name of the diviner dates the inscription as belonging to the time of Wu Ting). The inscription just referred to is one of those in which *t'sê* stands for a letter. It is true that Mr. Tung Tso-pin formerly suggested that this character represented the tortoise shells used for divination (*An Yang Fa Chieh Pao Kao*, Academia Sinica, Peiping and Shanghai, 1929-33, pp. 127-29), but he has subsequently altered this opinion and is now firmly convinced that there was a very considerable literature, quite aside from the bone inscriptions, even in Shang times (verbal communication of Feb. 10, 1934).

⁴ Only a part of even the *chün wên* text of the *Shang Shu* or *Shu Ching* was written in Western Chou times, while we can not be sure that any of the *I Li* or the *Kuo Yü* come from that period. Certain sections of them, if studied and criticised carefully, can give us information concerning the period, however.

⁵ While some of the explanations of hexagrams found in the *Kuo Yü* and the *Tso Chuan* are quoted from the *I Ching*, others are quite different from the explanation of the same hexagram found in that work. Compare, for instance, *Kuo Yü*, "Chou Yü hsia," middle of the second discourse, with *Chou I*, Shih San Ching," 1. 1f. and 2. 13bf.

⁶ It would be desirable to establish the convention of using the term *Shu Ching* to refer to that work considered as one of the Thirteen Classics

ku wên text, is generally recognized to be a forgery, dating from about the third century A. D. Of the remaining half, a considerable portion is forged, and of that which is genuine a part is later than the Western Chou period. Even some of the documents which were actually written in the Western Chou period are forgeries which were composed as a part of the attempt to consolidate the power of the Chou kings, and ascribed to the Shang period. When all of these subtractions have been made, we are left with a total of between nine and twelve documents in the *Shu Ching* which we are justified in declaring to be indubitably genuine and representative documents of the Western Chou period.⁷

On the other hand, there are literally hundreds of inscribed bronzes, certified by the concurrent opinion of many experts to be genuine products of the Western Chou dynasty, which are available for study. Kuo Mo-jô has estimated that "At the present time there are more than four thousand Chinese bronzes bearing inscriptions in the hands of collectors; most of these are relics of the Chou dynasty."⁸

It is true that the majority of these inscriptions are quite brief. But there is current an altogether exaggerated opinion in this respect, which is represented by Karlgren's early statement that "A number of bronzes are preserved, but their inscriptions—where these exist—are meagre and unilluminating."⁹ This puts the case much too strongly.

of Chinese orthodoxy, while employing the term *Shang Shu* to denote that small portion of this work which consists of ancient and genuine historical documents. For the term *Ching* is of comparatively late origin, and is peculiarly appropriate in the context of literary orthodoxy. *Shang Shu*, on the other hand, is an earlier term, and its original meaning, as I have shown in a manuscript which is not yet published, is "treasured books," that is, "archives."

⁷ This statement is made on the basis of comparison of these books with the style and content of Western Chou bronze inscriptions, and with the history as contained in other documents. This shows that the "Ta Kao," "K'ang Kao," "Chiu Kao," "Tzû Ts'ai," "Shao Kao," "Lo Kao," "To Shih," "Chün Shih," and "To Fang" are almost certainly of the Western Chou period, "Wên Hou Chih Ming" probably so, and the "Ku Ming" and "Pei Shih" possibly of that period.

Certain other books, such as the "Hsi Po K'an Li," were apparently written in Western Chou times, but they can not be called representative documents because they are forgeries, attributed to the Shang period.

⁸ *Ku Tai Ming K'ê Hui K'ao* I. Appendix 1a, Tokyo, 1933.

⁹ Bernhard Karlgren, *Sound and Symbol in Chinese*, pp. 9-10, London, 1923.

For research on the Western Chou period I have used a selected group of two hundred and nineteen bronze inscriptions. It is not, of course, comprehensive, but it does include virtually every inscription of importance, and it has the advantage that every one of these inscriptions is well-known and has withstood general scholarly criticism as to its authenticity. Among these there are very few inscriptions of less than ten or a dozen characters. Most of them consist of between twenty and fifty characters, but a number are much longer. The table which follows has been prepared to show the occurrence of long inscriptions in this group. To give a basis of comparison with the transmitted literature, I have set down the names of some of the shorter books of the *chin wên* text of the Shu Ching, with the number of characters they contain.

WESTERN CHOU BRONZE INSCRIPTIONS ¹⁰		SHU CHING ¹¹	
No. of Characters	No. of Inscriptions	No. of Characters	Name of Book
70 to 99	Ten	81	Kao Tsung Yung Jih
100 to 133	Sixteen	88	Kan Shih
151 to 152	Three	124	Hsi Po K'an Li
291	One	145	T'ang Shih
357	One	182	Pei Shih
390	One	211	Wên Hou Chih Ming
403	One	228	Wei Tzû
497	One	246	Ch'in Shih
		247	Mu Shih
		253	Tzû Ts'ai

From these facts it may be seen that the bronze inscriptions are by no means negligible from the point of view of the quantity of writing which they contain. But although this be granted, it is

¹⁰ These inscriptions, in the order in which they are listed, are reproduced in: Wu Shih-fên, *Chün Ku Lu Chün Wên* (1895), 3 *shang*. 67, 77, 78, 79, 83, 86, 3 *chung*. 1, 8, 9, 15, 17, 18, 20, 21, 22, 24, 25, 27, 33, 35, 37, 51, 52, 56, 58, 67, 3 *hsia*. 3, 8, 20, 31, 37, 42, 46, 51. Reference is made to this work because it is relatively comprehensive. But since it consists merely of copies of the inscriptions, it is not so useful for actual research as Wu Ta-ch'êng's *K'ê Chai Chi Ku Lu*, 1896, which reproduces actual rubbings in facsimile.

¹¹ These figures are based on the *chin wên* text, which, being reconstituted in slightly different form by various scholars, will sometimes show a difference of a few characters in the length of individual books, depending on the version followed.

sometimes urged that, after all, these inscriptions merely repeat the same formulae over and over again, and tell us very little. It is true that bronze inscriptions, especially the very brief ones, run to formulae. But not all of them do, nor are those which are cast in formulae without great value. The formulae which we find, for instance, for investing a vassal with a fief, or for rewarding a triumphant general who returns with his spoil and his captives and makes his report, are ceremonies concerning which we have little contemporary evidence aside from these bronzes. The inscriptions on bronzes cast for wedding presents hold loosely to a formula, but they tell us much about the social, political, and religious conditions of the times.

Let us consider a few of the occasions for which these bronze vessels were cast. A vassal is enfeoffed by the king, in a court ceremony which may include a moral and religious lecture written for the king in advance by his ministers, and presented with certain ritual gifts; he makes a bronze vessel to record the fact, giving details of the ceremony in the inscription. A vassal, having performed some service for the king, is rewarded with ceremony, and in commemoration of the fact makes a vessel dedicated to his ancestors and designed to be used for sacrifice, to secure for himself blessings and long life without end, and to be used by his descendants forever. On a military raid to "punish" certain barbarians rich spoil of shell money is obtained; the maker of the vessel records that he used his share of the loot to make this vessel. The transfer of lands is recorded, with details of the areas involved. A treaty, cast on bronze, defines the boundaries between states. Two feudal lords dispute over a piece of land; the king settles the quarrel, but he has to send an army to subdue the loser. Complicated commercial transactions involving horses, slaves, silk, and metal used as money are recorded. An instance of acceptance of a fine, in lieu of punishment, is recorded as a case of unusual clemency.

This is no more than a suggestion of the sort of material these inscriptions contain. But it will be seen that when we have so few authentic documents from this period, they hardly deserve the oblivion in which scholarship has left them up to the present time. Careful comparative study of them tells us a great deal which we should otherwise have no way of knowing, and corrects many mistaken impressions. Scholars have depended too much, in the past, upon works such as the *Chou Li*, which present us with the artificial,

idealized schemes of administration and social organization which later scholars read into the early period. The bronzes show us the period as it was, a rough and ready time in which institutions were flexible and growing, not fixed. We can learn the same thing, to be sure, from parts of the *Shang Shu*, and for an even later period from the *Kuo Yü* and the *Tso Chuan*.¹² But the text of the *Shang Shu* has been so garbled by interpretation that we can hardly understand some passages without reference to the bronze inscriptions as a key,¹³ and the *Kuo Yü* and *Tso Chuan* were compiled so

¹² Maspero, *La Chine Antique*, p. 124, says, "Aussi un noble ne devait-il se marier qu'une fois; c'était une règle absolue, aussi bien pour le Fils du Ciel que pour le simple patricien: le mari veuf ne pouvait pas se remarier, et les cas de seconds mariages cités par les historiens sont toujours blâmes." No doubt such an absolute rule did exist in the minds of the late scholars who made up the codes of *li* which have come down to us, but there was no such rule in actual operation in the early period. From the *Kuo Yü* and *Tso Chuan* (cf. *Kuo Yü*, "Chin Yü," second discourse; *Tso Chuan*, "Shih San Ching," 15. 16b-17a; etc.) and even the *Shih Ching*, Legge, p. 55 f, we see clearly that remarriage of men and even of women was by no means uncommon.

In fact even 禮 *li*, down to a very late date, specifically provided for the remarriage of patricians, both men and women. The very late "Chuan" of the *I Li* prescribes that, in case of the death of a woman who has a son, "The father must wait three years before remarrying, in respect to his son's feelings" (Shih San Ching, *I Li* 30. 6a; Steele's tr. II. 15-16). And the text of the *I Li* prescribes the mourning to be worn in cases where "the father dies, and the stepmother remarries" (op. cit. 30. 7b; tr. II. 16).

If, as Maspero says, historians in referring to cases of remarriage do so with censure, they do so from the point of view of the code of a later day. But we can not write history by reading these later prohibitions and elaborate schemes of social and political organization back into a time when they did not operate if they even existed.

¹³ A good instance of this is the use of the character 獻 *hsien* as it occurs in the "Chiu Kao" p. 13 (Legge, *Shoo-King*, p. 410) and the "Lo Kao" p. 23 (*ibid.* p. 447). In both cases it refers to the Yin people, under Chou rule after the conquest. In one case they are spoken of as "Yin *hsien* 臣 *ch'ên*" and in the other as "Yin *hsien* 民 *min*."

The commentators, looking back on the events to which these books refer through a haze of orthodox philosophy and the orthodox romanticizing of history, could not understand the use of *hsien* in this place. The character commonly means "to sacrifice" or "to give to a superior"; in its earlier form it is a pictograph of a 鬲 *li* surmounted by a colander-like upper portion, forming the "steamer" which the character denotes, as a noun (a dog was later added to the character, because dog meat was frequently offered in such vessels). But the commentators could find no way to make

late and contain so much that is of dubious origin that they can not compete with the bronze inscriptions as authentic touchstones by which to test the institutions of the early period.

But the importance of the bronze inscriptions as providing standards of comparison for other literature is at least as great as their importance as primary source materials. For the most part we have had to content ourselves with what were, after all, very subjective criteria. The *chin wên* text of the *Shu Ching* has been pointed out as "more difficult to read" than the *ku wên* text, and therefore older. But this judgment depends partly upon the subsequent fashions in Chinese literary style. Scholars who learned to recite the *Four Books* as children sometimes consider intrinsically difficult passages in the *Mencius* or the *Analects* simple, merely because they are familiar. But we have had very little of which we could say: "This is an original, unaltered document of the Western Chou period, the style of which we may study and use as a standard

this square with the text of the *Shu*; they pronounced it to be equivalent to the character 賢 *hsien*, and in accordance with this Legge translates "the worthy ministers of Yin" and "the good and wise men of Yin." But this is quite out of place in the circumstances, where the Yin people are the conquered population with whom they are having a good deal of trouble. If it be said that this was flattery, why does this not show itself in the "To Shih" and "To Fang," proclamations made directly to these people? Instead, the tone of these proclamations is distinctly stiff.

From the use on bronze inscriptions of this term *hsien* as an adjective referring to men (cf. *Chün Ku Lu, Chin Wên* 3 *hsia*. 31; Lo Chên-yü, *Chên Sung T'ang Chi Ku I Wên* 6, 12; etc.) we know its meaning. It was the custom to sacrifice captives of war; human sacrifice was common during Yin and early Chou times. *Hsien min*, or "people of the *hsien*," were people dedicated to sacrifice, men whose lives, since they had been captured, were forfeit. That the Chou rulers felt thus toward the Yin people is shown in the addresses made directly to them, as "The king says, 'I declare to you, ye numerous officers of Yin—now I have not put you to death.'" (*To Shih*, Legge, p. 462), and the threat held over them that "I will proceed to severe punishments and put you to death" (*To Fang*, Legge, p. 504). The meaning, then, of *hsien min* or *hsien ch'ên* is "captive slaves," i. e., men who might be put to death but are allowed to live as slaves instead (the original meaning of *ch'ên* is not "minister" but "captive"; the trace of this may be found even in the *Shuo Wên*, which is mistaken, however, as to the etymology of the character). It occurs in this sense repeatedly on the bronzes, where such persons are given to vassals, as rewards for service, by the hundreds. It is used with this same meaning, but in a somewhat figuratively sense, of the conquered Yin people in the passages in the *Shang Shu* cited above.

by which to test other documents which are claimed to be from that time." But we do have just this in a large number of bronze inscriptions.

It may be objected that the bronze inscriptions can not be used as a standard of the literary style of the time which produced them, because we have no way of knowing that they do not represent a special type of composition in a peculiar style. But this is not quite true. It was the custom, when the king or, in some cases, other rulers gave land or other gifts to their vassals, to accompany the gift with a speech of presentation. Although this might be spoken, it was usually (in the case of presentations important enough to be commemorated by the casting of a vessel) written in advance by an official, and read aloud at the order of the ruler. At the conclusion of the ceremony this written document was handed to the recipient of the gift, who thrust it in his girdle and withdrew.¹⁴ The same ceremony is described in the *I Li*.¹⁵ When the recipient cast a bronze he copied this document, *verbatim*, into its inscription, in a number of cases.

In these inscriptions, then, we have permanently and unalterably recorded the text of ordinary, representative state documents of the Western Chou period. Contained within the 219 Western Chou inscriptions mentioned above there are twenty-nine such documents. A few are very brief, but twelve of them contain more than fifty characters. One has one hundred characters,¹⁶ another one hundred forty-eight,¹⁷ and another four hundred seventy-six.¹⁸ When the style and vocabulary of these sections are compared with other portions of the inscriptions, and with bronze inscriptions generally, they do not appear to differ in any essential particular. We are therefore justified in considering the Western Chou bronze inscriptions generally to represent the ordinary documentary style of the period, only making allowances for the peculiarities of formula naturally to be expected.

¹⁴ Cf. *Chün Ku Lu Chün Wên*, 3 *hsia*. 4b, and elsewhere.

¹⁵ "Shih San Ching," *I Li* 27. 5ab; Steele tr. II. 5-6. In this case, however, the official who reads the document aloud does not hand it to the recipient, but lays it on the presented clothing, achieving the same end.

¹⁶ *Chün Ku Lu Chün Wên* 3 *hsia*. 8.

¹⁷ *Li Tai Chung Ting I Ch'i K'uan Shih Fa T'ieh* (Liu Shih ed., Wuchang, 1903) chüan 14, next to last inscription, "Mu Tun."

¹⁸ *Chün Ku Lu Chün Wên*, 3 *hsia*. 51.

When these inscriptions are compared with other literature of the time, and especially with those books of the *Shu Ching* or *Shang Shu* which we have most reason to believe genuine, a number of remarkable similarities appear. The vocabulary and the grammar are, generally speaking, almost the same. I have checked a number of phrases of three or four characters which are used habitually both on bronzes and in the literature of the Western Chou period, but are rare or lacking in later materials. Official titles, and political, religious, and philosophical ideas show surprising correspondences. Part of the inscription on the Ta Yü Ting¹⁹ deals with the same subject matter as part of the "Chiu Kao" of the *Shu Ching*.²⁰ The document in the *Shu* called "Wên Hou Chih Ming"²¹ is so like the bronze inscriptions that it might have been copied from one. In content it is essentially similar to the "Mao Kung Ting,"²² but it is worthy of note that in this case the document preserved on bronze is two and one-quarter times as long as that transmitted in the *Shu Ching*.

I have compared each book of the *chün wên* section of the *Shu Ching* with the style of the bronzes, with results which are new in a few instances, but which chiefly serve to confirm judgments already arrived at on the basis of other evidence. Quite a little of this type of criticism is being done at the present time by qualified Chinese scholars. But analysis of the style and vocabulary of the bronzes has not yet advanced to the point where we have much in the way of objective criteria. There is a great deal of opportunity for valuable future work in the discovery and use of such criteria. Let us consider a single instance.

The book of the *Shu Ching* called "P'an Kêng"²³ has been accepted as a genuine product of the Shang dynasty even by those who would allow no date so early for any other document in that work. Ku Chieh-kang so accepted it, for instance, in the first volume of the *Ku Shih Pien*.²⁴ But if it is compared with the Shang oracle bones wide differences are at once apparent, in content as well as in style.²⁵ The style of the work is, in fact, too smooth

¹⁹ *Chün Chün Wên Ku Lu* 3 hsia. 31.

²² *Chün Ku Lu Chün Wên* 3 hsia.

²⁰ Legge, p. 399 ff.

²³ Legge, p. 220.

²¹ Legge, p. 613.

²⁴ (1926), p. 201.

²⁵ For instance the city is spoken of as Yin rather than Shang, and the idea of 天命 *T'ien ming* is fully developed, although the very character *T'ien* does not seem to appear in the published bone inscriptions. The

and flowing even for the Western Chou period. But when we examine minutely we find even greater discrepancies.

An analysis of one hundred and thirty-eight of the longer Western Chou bronze inscriptions, made by my assistant, showed a total of only fourteen occurrences of the common character 之 *chih*. But similar analysis of one hundred and fourteen Eastern Chou inscriptions showed eighty-one occurrences of this character. Furthermore, the use of *chih* in the Western Chou period is limited and narrow, compared with later practice.²⁶ The older books of the *Shu* are in general sparing in their use of *chih*, and universally narrow in the range of uses to which it is applied.

But in the "P'an Kêng" of the *Shu* we find *chih* no less than twenty-two times. And it is used with a freedom which is not typical of the early Chou period, and gives to the whole style a cast which is foreign to that time; in some cases it is used in a manner which seems to be definitely absent from early Western Chou prose.²⁷ Such frequent use of this character, and the use of it in this way, are even less characteristic of the Shang oracle bones. Judging from these various criteria, I believe that there is no doubt that the "P'an Kêng" is a forgery, written not during the Shang period but in the Chou, and not even at the beginning of the Chou dynasty. Upon comparing notes with Ku Chieh-kang I have found that he no longer considers the "P'an Kêng" a Shang work.

The difficulty of dating bronze inscriptions with accuracy hampers such use of them. A few, like that of the "Hsiao Ch'ên Chih" ²⁸ definitely date themselves by references to names and events as well as by the form of their characters and their content generally. But these are rare. Yet this difficulty is not so great as it may seem at first. The style of formation of the characters changed rapidly. It is possible for one who is accustomed to working with these

instances, somewhat less than ten, in which *T'ien* is said to appear on the oracle bones, are very doubtful, and for the most part unquestionably mistaken; in any case all appear to date from the closing period of the dynasty, while the P'an Kêng is supposed to be from the middle.

²⁶ In these fourteen cases, *chih* is used seven times as a pronoun, four times to connect a preceding adjectival phrase with the following noun it modifies, and three times to connect two nouns as a simple genitive particle.

²⁷ As in the phrase 火之燎于原 (Legge, p. 229).

²⁸ 王後反克商在成師周公錫小臣單貝十朋 *Chên Sung T'ang Chi Ku I Wên* 9. 29a.

inscriptions to take a list of the different forms of a single character as it appears on fifty bronzes and, from the form of the single character, distinguish those of early and those of late Chou date with virtually no error. When there is added to this the inscription as a whole, with its style and content, there is little difficulty in dating within an error of a century or thereabouts. From the standpoint of the study of political history such an error is tremendous, of course, but for the study of the literary style of a period and for the history of culture it is not very serious. Forged inscriptions have also presented a problem. But clever as Chinese forgers are, I believe that very little in the way of forged bronze inscriptions of importance passes through the keen, coöperative examination of the present generation of Chinese paleographers.

Chinese scholars have been collecting, studying, and publishing bronze inscriptions, and doing something with their translation, ever since the Sung dynasty. But the important work which makes them really available as material for research has come, for the most part, in recent decades, largely as a result of the renewed interest in paleography and the new material for its study given by recent discoveries, including that of the Shang oracle bones in 1899. At the present time there are some half dozen Chinese scholars, nearly all comparatively young, who are doing research of the first importance in this field, and initiating a younger generation of disciples. Their publications appear as books and as articles scattered throughout various journals. A society for this type of research was inaugurated in Peiping in 1934; it publishes a semi-annual report of research, which may in time lead to the publication of a journal.²⁹

Western scholarship can present little to compare with the work of these Chinese investigators. Wiegner, in his *Caractères Chinois*,³⁰ in the section called "Graphies Antiques," gives facsimiles, and essays translation of a large number of bronze inscriptions. These are referred to by scholars of reputation in such manner as to cause the unwary to suppose them to be reliable. Karlgren refers to them without criticism,³¹ and Maspero mentions three of the translations with only the caution that they are "un peu trop libre."³²

²⁹ This bulletin, published in Peiping, is called 考古學社社刊.

³⁰ My references to this work are all to the third edition, 1916.

³¹ Bernhard Karlgren, *Analytic Dictionary of Chinese* (Paris, 1923), pp. 1-2.

³² *La Chine Antique*, p. 86, n. 1.

It is true that the specific translations to which he refers are among the most correct in the work. But as to the translations as a group, something more requires to be said.

In the first place, Wieger's dating of inscriptions is more than doubtful. He gives two inscriptions which he says are "certainement" from the Hsia dynasty. I know of no qualified scholar, Chinese or foreign, who speaks of inscribed bronzes from the Hsia dynasty. Recent research seems to indicate that the casting of inscriptions containing more than two or three characters was probably an innovation of the last century of the Shang period.⁸³ The form of the characters of these supposed Hsia inscriptions is exactly like that of late Chou times. Some of Wieger's so-called Shang inscriptions may be correctly ascribed, but the second one cannot be earlier than late Chou; the highly ornate, elongated, spidery characters, the arrangement of the inscription, and the phraseology are typically late.⁸⁴

As to his translations, let us consider the following inscription: ⁸⁵

Author's transcription:



寶 □
 障 作
 祖
 彝 乙

⁸³ The old theory of Western museum experts that there were no Shang bronzes has long since been exploded by the scientific excavation of ore, slag, and hundreds of pieces of moulds for bronze vessels on the site of the Shang capital at Anyang, in strata dated by the oracle bone inscriptions, and dozens of vessels in Shang tombs. And we have hundreds of bronze vessels which are undoubtedly Shang, of which a large proportion are inscribed.

But almost all of these inscriptions are from one to three characters long. It has been estimated that Shang bronzes with long inscriptions do not number as many as ten. Furthermore, we now have a chronological series of the forms of the characters used on the oracle bones at various periods, and when this is compared with bronzes the forms seem to tally with peculiar forms found on the bones only for the very end of the Shang period. (For a part of this evidence, cf. *Chia Ku Wen Tuan Tai Yen Chiu*, p. 410.)

⁸⁴ Cf. *Caractères Chinois*, p. 454.

⁸⁵ Inscription copied after Wieger, *Caractères Chinois*, p. 433.

In this inscription the columns read from right to left; this is not always the case on bronzes.

Wieger translates the first character as "*Moi fils encore armé du couteau*—" But this is really a proper name for which we have no modern equivalent. It is a man holding a knife, but in the context he is a grandson rather than a son.

He renders the second character as "*en présence de l'ancêtre*." This is the most remarkable and persistent error in Wieger's translations. He says "*La présence de l'ancêtre à qui l'offrande est faite, est figurée le plus souvent par [cf. inscription, second character] le talon de son pied*."³⁸ This is apparently an original idea of Wieger's, based on the resemblance of this character to 止, for Chinese scholars since the Sung dynasty have been translating it as 作 *tso*, "*make*,"³⁷ and from its use in hundreds of inscriptions there is no question that this is correct; we can learn this even from the *Shuo Wen Chieh Tzū* if the *jên* element, a late addition, is subtracted.

The third character Wieger translates as "*j'offre viande crue*." Elsewhere he explains: "*le fils offre la viande crue découpée, disposée sur les rayons d'un dressoir, maintenant 且*."³⁸ Obviously he has confused this character with 且 *tsu*, with which it does have some etymological connection. But thousands of the Shang oracle bones, scores of bronze inscriptions, and the universal testimony of Chinese scholarship show this character to be 祖 *tsu*, "*grandfather*," "*ancestor*," and in fact Wieger himself so translates it elsewhere.³⁹

The fourth character he translates as (we must repeat "*j'offre*") "*libation*." He explains this as "*un . . . sorte de larme, symbole du liquide répandu à terre, en libation*."⁴⁰ But this is really only the second of the ten stems, 乙 *i*. The calendric tables on the Shang oracle bones,⁴¹ the dating formulae of many bronzes, the *Shuo Wen Chieh Tzū*, the universal testimony of Chinese scholarship, and Wieger's own translation when it appears in dating formulae⁴² concur to prove this.

³⁸ *Loc. cit.*

³⁷ Cf. *Li Tai Chung Ting I Ch'i K'uan Shih Fa T'ieh*, chüan 10, first inscription, and *passim*.

³⁸ *Caractères Chinois*, p. 428. ³⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 465, 467. ⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 425.

⁴¹ Cf. *Yin Hsü Shu Ch'i Ch'ien Pien* 3. 4. 2, etc.

⁴² *Caractères Chinois*, pp. 453, 492, and 506.

He translates the fifth character as ("j'offre") "objets précieux." It is true that it represents jade, cowries, etc., but they are contained, not as he says in a coffer,⁴³ but in a building, a treasury; all oracle bone and bronze forms⁴⁴ and the *Shuo Wen Chieh Tzû* agree on this. This is, as Wieger knew, the common character 寶 *pao*, but here it functions not as a plural noun but as an adjective, "precious" or "valuable," modifying the last character.

The sixth character is translated as ("j'offre") "vin." He explains it as "une amphore de vin, soutenue par deux mains, avec un instrument pour brasser ou pour poiser." This is an ancient form of the character 奠 *tsun* or 樽 *tsun*, which now means "a wine vessel." But it originally denoted a sacrifice of wine, "a vessel of wine being lifted up (before the spirits) by two hands." The element on the left is not a stirrer, but a set of stair-steps, emphasizing the idea of "lifting up"; we find it in the bronze forms of many characters meaning to ascend, and descend, etc., as in 陟 *chih*, 降 *chiang*, etc.⁴⁵ *Tsun* is commonly used in bronze inscriptions as an adjective meaning "sacrificial," and this is its sense here.

The final character is rendered by Wieger as ("j'offre") "flassee." But this character, 彝 *i*, denotes a sacrificial vessel, possibly in the form of, or perhaps decorated with, a bird, not a bunch of fibers. It is the metamorphosis of the bird's tail, in the transition from the Shang to the Chou form, which has led Wieger astray. For details, see my paper on this character in the *JAOS* 52. 22-34.⁴⁶

Wieger's full translation of this inscription is: "*Moi fils encore armé du couteau, en présence de l'ancêtre, j'offre viande crue, libation, objets précieux, vin, flassee.*"⁴⁷ A correct translation would be: "So-and-so (untranslatable proper name) makes for (i. e. dedicates to) Grandfather (or a more remote ancestor) *I* a precious sacrificial vessel."

This is one of the most common of all types of inscriptions. It will be noted that Wieger fails to render a single character correctly. This is the more remarkable when we consider that the Chinese have been publishing substantially correct interpretations of such inscriptions, in books which are commonly current, since the Sung dynasty.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, p. 429.

⁴⁴ Cf. *Yin Hsi Shu Ch'i Hou Pien hsia* 18. 3, and Jung K'ang, *Chin Wen Pien* (1925) 7. 15-17.

⁴⁵ Cf. especially pp. 26-28.

⁴⁶ Cf. *Chin Wen Pien* 14, 8b.

⁴⁷ *Caractères Chinois*, p. 433.

Apparently Wieger considered it unnecessary to consult the previous work of Chinese scholars; such neglect is always dangerous. This is not the only inscription of which his translation is totally wrong. In the second inscription on p. 518 he has mistaken the proper order of the columns, though this again follows a common formula. In his translation of longer inscriptions the percentage of error is less, though he is sometimes led into mistakes through insufficient understanding of the ceremonies described.⁴⁸

The importance of the history of the Chou dynasty from the time of Confucius, as the foundation of all Chinese history, is generally recognized. But the importance of understanding the early Chou dynasty, as prerequisite to understanding all the later history, is widely ignored in practice if not in theory. We shall never understand the Western Chou period properly until we have thoroughly studied and utilized the bronze inscriptions.

Up to the present time the study of bronze inscriptions has been almost entirely concerned with the decipherment and study of characters. A very few Chinese and still fewer Western scholars have used them for the study of history and the history of culture. It is still true that in almost every long inscription there are one or more characters or even passages of whose meaning we can not be certain, and it may be that this will always be the case. But the great body, and in most cases the most important parts, of the inscriptions are perfectly clear. And it is time that this material was utilized to throw additional light upon the Western Chou period—an epoch, of prime importance, when Chinese institutions were in the making, but on which we shall never have any too much illumination. The late Wang Kuo-wei, who might almost be called the father of the study of bronze inscriptions in this generation, has said that they are mistaken who would try to force a meaning on every part of an inscription, even though some of it may really be incomprehensible in the present state of our knowledge. But they are also wrong, he continues, who refuse to make use of the vast riches which the bronze inscriptions lay before us merely because there are parts of them which we can not fully understand.

⁴⁸ For instance on p. 511 he takes 冊命 *t'sé ming* to mean "to write down an order." But this is a common expression, meaning "to command by means of a document," i. e., to read aloud an order which had previously been written.

REVIEWS OF BOOKS

The Brāhūi Language. Part II: The Brāhūi Problem. Part III: Etymological Vocabulary. By Sir DENYS BRAY. Delhi: MANAGER OF [GOVERNMENT] PUBLICATIONS, 1934. Pp. ii + 313. 13 s. 6 d.

The first portion of this work appeared in 1909. The belated second portion is a welcome surprise; I had given up all hope of seeing it. The first 43 pages discuss the customs, history, and language of the Brāhūis. The rest of the book is a vocabulary with illustrative sentences and with etymologies or what are meant for such.

The history of a language must be based primarily on the history of its sounds. Bray seems to have a rather feeble knowledge of fonology. Brāhūi and Kanara have initial *b* for *v* < *w*; he thinks that this shows a closer relation to Kanara than to Tamil and Telugu, which have initial *v*. This is mere guess-work; the agreement may have come from separate Aryan influences. In the treatment of *ṇ* Telugu goes with Brāhūi and the other northern tongues: Telugu *kannu*, Brāhūi *xan*, against Kanara-Tamil *kan* (eye). In the treatment of gender Telugu stands between Kanara-Tamil and Gondi-Kui (*BSOS* 4. 769); it is therefore nearer to Brāhūi than Kanara is.

I cannot agree with Bray in thinking that the Malto sound written “*q*” is an occlusive. From Droese’s description (quoted by Bray) and from the closeness of Malto to Kurukh, which has the velar fricative *x*, it seems clear that Malto “*q*” is really *x*. Apparently the change of *k* or *kh* to *x*, found in Brāhūi and in Kurukh-Malto, marks a fairly close connection of these two northernmost divisions of Dravidian speech. It should, however, be noted that Tamil, as spoken, often has an intervocalic fricative corresponding to the written *k*-symbol.

Bray finds evidence of close connection of Brāhūi and Kurukh-Malto in four words apparently represented in these languages alone. This is doubtful. Latin *incipere* and *intellegere* are represented in Rumanian and Retian, but these two divisions of Romanic are not closely connected. Bray holds that the Brāhūi negative-

suffix *-a* has its closest parallel in Kui. But the same suffix is found in Telugu and is represented by vowel-lengthening in Tamil.

Bray's etymologies show many defects. In the following list I give first the Brāhui word; then one or more of Bray's compared words; then my additions or corrections. I use *ō* for a vowel of uncertain quality; *u* for unrounded *u*; *j* = Dutch *j*; *ḷ* for voiceless reverted *l*; *R* for a former voiceless *r*; *ξ* = Bohemian *ǵ*. *DD* refers to my *Dravidian Developments*.

-ā "the" = genitive-ending *-ā*. Add general Dravidian *a*, *ā* "that."

-ā suffix of past time: Dravidian *-i*. No; Kurukh *-ā* (*AJP* 50. 146).

ant "what": Kui *ana*. No; Kui *ena*. Brāhui interrogatives are from the *e-ē*-basis; old short *e* has regularly become *a* in Brāhui, but that does not justify comparison with the *a*-interrogatives of Kui, as Kui *a* and *e* are kept distinct.

all- negative past-base of "be": Tamil *alla*, *illai*, Gōndi *hallē* "is not." The definition is wrong. The negative base is *alla-*, with *-a* expressing negation. Tamil *illai* is a different word, as shown by its cognates, Gōndi *hillē* with normal *h* < *s* and Kui *side* with normal *ḍ* < *l* (*DD* § 38). Gōndi *hallē* has taken *h* from *hillē*. Add Kurukh *malā*, Malto *mala*, with *m* from *man-*, *men-* "be."

a(r)- "be": Tamil *ir-*, Kurukh *ra-*. No; *ra-* is Aryan (Hindi *rah-*). The *r* of *ar-* is found only in the present and is not radical. The past *ass* corresponds to the Gōndi participle *āsī*. The Brāhui stem is *a-*, corresponding to Gōndi *a-*, *ā-*, Kui *ā-*, Telugu *a-*, Kanara *ā-*, Tamil *ā-*.

arē "person": Brāhui *ar-* "be." No; Gōndi *ār* "woman."

asi "one": Dravidian *oru*, with *s* < *r*. No; Tulu *ondži* < **ontri*; ep. Tamil *onRu* < **ontrō* < **or-unṭ-* "being one." Brāhui has *asi* < **ontši* < **ontri* < **or-unṭ-*. For the loss of the nasal, ep. Brāhui *uṭ* "am" beside Tamil *unṭu*.

aṭ "how many": Tamil *ettanai*. No; Kanara *eṣṭu* < **ectu* (*DD* § 3).

āvān- "yawn": Kurukh *aula-*. Add Tamil *āvi-*, Telugu *āvaliñc-*, Tulu *āval-*.

bā "mouth": Tamil *vāj*. The basis is **wās*, perhaps derived from Aryan **ōs*. The native Dravidian word was **or*, represented in Brāhui **dōr* (= Dardic *dōr*), Gōndi *mussōr*, Kui *suḍa*, Malto *toro*, Telugu *nōru* (*BSOS* 8. 813).

bāmus "nose" : Brāhui *bā* and *must* "before." No; the second element corresponds to Malto *muso* "nose"; cp. Gōndi *mussōr*, a compound corresponding to Malto *muso* and Gōndi **sōr* < **or*.

balun "big" : Telugu *balu*, Tamil *val*. Bray forgets that Telugu is a *v*-language. If *balu* belongs with *val*, it has been blended with Aryan *bala*. Add Gōndi *vallē* "much," Kui *vlē*- 'swell'?

ba(r)- "come" : cognates with *r* except in Kui. The root is **wa*; the widely added *r* corresponds to the Kui personal-object suffix.

bāṭay "top" : Kanara *mēṭi* "head." No; Kanara *baḍaga* "north"?

bē "salt" : Kurukh *bēk*, Malto *bēku*. The *k* is a plural-ending (= Tamil *-kal*), which has been generally lost in Kurukh-Malto.

bēi "grass" : Tamil *mēj*- "graze." No; Kui *vīa* "thatch-grass." Basis **wahī*?

bērif- "thatch" : Kui *vē*-. Winfield gives Kui *veg*- "thatch," *vē*- "be cookt." Why not mention Kui *vīori* "thatch"?

bīn "hunger" : Kanara *bēne* "pain." Rather Kanara *bē*-, Tamil *vēṇ*- "want."

bīr- "milk" : Gōndi *pīr*-. Possible if the Gōndi *p* came from *pāl* "milk."

dā "this" : *ā* < *a* < *i*, with *ā* < *āz* < *j* added before a palatal vowel. This cannot be admitted. In *dā* "this" beside *ē* "that" and *ō* "that" the lack of symmetry is remarkable, compared with the symmetry of demonstratives in the other Dravidian tongues. The only reasonable explanation is that *dā* is from Afghan *dā*. A change of *j* thru *āz* to *ā* is unknown in Dravidian: Tulu *džāne*, a dialectal variant of *dāne* "what," represents **diā* ... < **dē* ... < **ē* ..., parallel with Tamil *jān* < **ēn*, the *ā* being added as explained below (see *dēr*). See *dāxa* and *ē*.

dā-, *dē*- "take" : Gōndi *ē*-. Add Tulu *dē*-; Tulu is closely related to Gōndi-Kui (*DD* § 31). The root is **e*, lengthened in Gōndi. The Gōndi imperative *idā ē* (*id* + *ē*) "take this" explains the added *ā* : *idā ē* was misdivided as *id-dē*. Brāhui keeps *ē*, except before a nasal, but changes short *e* to *a* (see *hēf*-).

das- "sow" : Brāhui *dass*- "fell." Rather Gōndi *dās*- "put down"; *s* < *c* in both languages.

dēr "who" : Tamil *jāvar*, *jār*. Bray is wrong in thinking that the base was *jā*; it was *e* (*BSOS* 4. 777). He is also wrong in

thinking that *d* could develop from *j*. Literary Kanara has *ad ār* as a variant of *ār* (< **jār* < **ehar*) "who." The addition of *ad* "that thing" came from a misunderstanding of *ad ēn* "what is that?" as a simple "what"; *ad ār* was reduced to *dār*. Brāhui *dēr* likewise represents **ad *ehar*. Malto *nē*- and Kurukh *nē* came from a misdivision of **asan *ē* "who is he?" (BSOS 4. 778; 8. 815).

dāxa, a variant of *dāxa* "this much" : Telugu *dāni* "this thing." Telugu *dāni* is from **idāni*, the genitive of *idī*; -*dī* is the neuter-ending (cp. Kanara -*du*, Tamil -*tu*). Brāhui *dāxa* is from the *i-i*-basis, with *d* from *dāxa*, which is based on *dā* "this" (see above). Thus *dāxa* and *dāni*, or rather *idī*, are connected only thru the first vowels.

dār "water" : Tamil *nār*, Gōndi *ēr*, Kui *siru*. The Dravidian basis was apparently **ihar*; Gōndi *ēr* is parallel with *ēn* < **ian* < **isan* "this" (DD § 32). Brāhui *dār* is a reduction or misdivision of **ad *ir* "that is water" or "that water" (BSOS 8. 814). Southern *nār* came from a misdivision of **asan *ir* "that water"; Kui has a corresponding *niru* "juice." Kui *siru* is from **icar*; cp. Kanara *esaru* < **icar*, Gōndi *aṭ-jār* "boiling water." Sanskrit *nāra* came from Dravidian. See *xarṭṭk*.

ditar "blood" : Kanara *nettar*, Gōndi *nattur*. The *d* is like that of *dār*; *n* may have come from prefixt **enn* "my" (BSOS 8. 815). Basis **idhur*?

dū "hand" : Zébaki *dust*. Rather Dardic *dui*.

dūi "tongue" (*dūi* grammar § 25) : no etymology. Singhalese *div-a*.

e "is" : no et. Hindi *hai*? Ormuri *ē*?

ē "that" : Kui *ē* from the general Dravidian *a-ā*-basis. No; Kui has the demonstratives *i*, *ī*; *e*, *ē*; *a*, *ā*; *o*, *ō* (according to Friend-Pereira) : we have no right to say that any one of the four came from another. In view of Bray's idea that *dā* came from the *i-i*-basis, the theory that at the same time the *a-ā*-basis became *ē*, with a contrary development, is highly unreasonable. As I have pointed out above, Bray overlooks the derivation of Brāhui -*ā* "the" from the *a-ā*-basis. It is not likely that *ā* remained as such and also became *ē* in Brāhui. I think Singhalese *ē* is the source of the Brāhui word. Apparently Singhalese came from northern India.

-ē suffix of past time : Dravidian -i. Rather Kurukh -ia (*AJP* 50. 146).

garau "heap of stones" : no et. This looks like Singhalese *gala* "stone." Initial *g* seems to be generally foren in Brāhui except in a few imitative words, such as *gagall*- "bleat" and *gārr*- "bleat."

guṭ "throat" : Balūchi *guṭh*. I suspect that the latter came from Brāhui. The Brāhui word seems to represent **kuṣṭ* < **kurst* < **krust* < **kerust* (*DD* §§ 12, 44) ; the *g* could have come from Aryan influence, cp. Sanskrit *gala* or Bengāli *ghāḍ*.

hal "mouse, rat" : Tamil *eli*. Add Kuvi *orli*, Kui *oḍri* < **olri* < **orli* = Tamil *ōr eli* "one rat," and Kurukh *osgā* < **eusgā* < **elsagaḷ* < **elisagaḷ* (*DD* § 46). The Dravidian word may be connected with Aryan *giri* (cp. Portuguese *irmão* < *germānum*), and *giri* is similar to Austric equivalents (*JAOS* 49. 61).

hal- "take" : Tamil *koḷ*, with *h* < *k* as in *hullī*. This etymology and Bray's theory of *hullī* are hardly right. Rather Gōndi *arr*-, Hindi *har*-?

hanēn "sweet" : Tamil *ini*, Kurukh *embā*. Root **en*? with *a* < *e* in Brāhui and assimilation of **eni* to *ini* in the south. Cp. also Tamil *tēn* "honey," perhaps from **ēn* with *t* added from *tī* "sweet."

(*h*)*at*-, (*h*)*ata*-, (*h*)*ati*-, past (*h*)*ēs* "bring" : Brāhui *hal*- "take" and *ti*- "give." The root seems to be **et*, partially combined with a word resembling Kurukh *ajjā* "there" (*AJP* 50. 153) : Kurukh *tai*-, Malto *tei*- "send" ; Gōndi *ta*-, Kui *ta*-, Telugu *te*-, Kanara *ta*-, "bring" ; Tamil *ta*- "give."

hēf-, *harf*- "raise" : Tamil *ēR*-. Rather Tamil *erupp*- (*DD* § 48). Short *e* became *a* ; the lengthened vowel remained as *ē*. If *ēR*- came from **ers*-, it may have the same root **er*, implying *er*- < **erj*- (*DD* § 12).

hēt "goat" : Tamil *āṭū* [!]. Tamil *āṭu* is a reduction of older *jāṭu* < **ēṭ* ; cp. *ār* < *jār* < **ehar* (*BSOS* 4. 777 ; *DD* § 51).

hīdž- "fear" : Tamil *añc*-, Kurukh *eltš*-. A checking nasal produced vowel-closure as in *i* < **ēn* "I," *ārsun* < **hens*- "red." Perhaps *eltš*- < **ēñc*- < **aiñc*- ; *hīdž*- < **ēñc*- < **aiñc*- ; northern basis **aiñc*- < **añc*- < **alc*- < **ačl*- < **aṭl*- < **aṭal* ; southern basis *añc*- < **aṭal* ; Kui *adž*- < **ac*- < **alc*- < **aṭal* ; Kanara *aḍal*- < **aṭal* beside contracted *añč*- < **añc*- < **aṭl*- < **aṭal*.

hīlār "date" (fruit) : no et. Persian *xalāl*.

hāl "fly" : Tamil *ī*. Bray ignores Kui *viha*, *visa*, Gōndi *vist*. Basis **uīsa* : northern and southern *ī* < *ui*, central *wi* < *ui*. Telugu *īga*, Kurukh *ēwā* < **īska* : basis **uīska*?

hin- "go" : Gōndi *han-*. Add Kui *sal-*, Kolarian *sēn-*, *šen-*. The root seems to be **sln* (DD §§ 37, 46).

hōy- "weep" : imitative. Add Kurukh *olx-*, Malto *olγ-*, with *l* from "laugh" (see *max-*).

(*h*)*ōr* "finger" : Tamil *ukir* "nail." Rather Tamil *viral* "finger"; for the loss of final *l*, cp. *-k* = Tamil *-kaḷ* (plural-ending). Gōndi *varēndž* for **varēl* < **veral* < **wiral* by assimilation to *tirindž* "claw," also *virindž* with further assimilation. Kui *vandžu* < **valdro* < **walir* < **wiral*, with *ž* as in *mündži* = Tamil *mānRu* < **mūntrō* (see *musi*). Telugu *vēlu* < *vrēlu* < **varēl* < **veral* < **wiral*. Kanara *beral* < **wiral*, also *beral* (DD § 5). Basis **awiral*, contracted to **aural* in Brāhui; divided into a **wiral* "that finger" elsewhere.

hullī "horse" : Tamil *kutirai*. No; Burushaski *hulđžai* "mount a horse." Basis **huljai*?

hūhun "thick" : no et. Sanskrit *uru* "wide"?

hur- "look, look at" : Tamil *ōr-*. The root seems to be **snuḍ*, whence various words meaning "look at" or "see" : Gōndi *huḍ-*, *hur-*, Kui *sūḍ-*, *sūr-*, Malto *ṭunḍ-*, Tulu *hū-*, *sū-*, *tū-*, Telugu *cūc-* < **tūḍc-*, Tamil *nōkk-* < **nōḍg* (AJP 40. 84; DD §§ 1, 26, 37, 46).

huš- "burn" : Kanara *wri-*, Tamil *eri-*. Bray is wrong in assuming *huš* = Kanara *ul-* with *š* < *l*. Basis **wris*? whence *huš* < **urs* < **uris*; *eri-* < **ri* < **wris*. Add Gōndi *nirū-* < **iru* < **uri* < **wris*, Kui *rī* < **wris*.

illa "uncle" : Brāhui *ilum* "brother." Rather Kanara *aliḷa* "son-in-law, nephew"; *ll* for *lj* as in Telugu *alluḍu* "son-in-law."

iray "bread" : Tamil *irai* "food." No; Afghan *nayan* "bread" : *n-n* dissimilated to *r-n*; and final *n* lost as in *ī* < **ēn* "I." Tamil *-ai* is derived from **-as*.

irai "two" (substantive) : Kanara *eraḍu* "two," Tamil *iraiṭṭu* "double." From Bray's omission of Gōndi *raṇḍ*, Kui *riṇḍe* (< **iraṇṭō*), Telugu *reṇḍu* (< **eraṇḍu* < **iraṇṭō*), Tamil *iraṇṭu*, it is clear he does not understand that the forms mentioned have lost a nasal: *eraḍu* < **iraṇṭō* (DD § 7), *iraiṭṭu* < **iraṇṭṭō* (DD § 14), *irai* < **iraṇṭō* (DD § 48). The basis was apparently **rā*, represented with only a slight change in the Brāhui adjective *irā*.

The form **iranṭō* represents **rānṭō* < **rā-unṭō* "being two," with shortening of *ā* because the stress was put on the added initial vowel.

īr "sister": Brāhui *ilum* "brother." Perhaps Tamil *ilaijaḷ*, *ilaijāl* "sister" (from *ilai* = Kurukh *lellē* "young"), with the development **ilejaḷ*, **ilial*, **ilil*, **ilil*, **il*, earlier than the loss of final *l* after a weak vowel (see *hōr*).

istō "last night": Tamil *iravu* "night." Hardly. Perhaps Aryan *dōś* "night" combined with an adverb from the lost *i-i*-basis, **is* = *dāsā* "now" (see *dā*); for the sense, cp. Spanish *anoche* "last night" from *hac nocte*. Dissimilation could have changed **istōś* to *istō*.

-*l* plural-suffix: Tamil *-kaḷ*, Tulu *-kalu*. The Tulu form is *-kulu*; the basic vowel was apparently *o* or *u*. Add Badaga *-gro*, *-gru* (DD § 53).

-*k* past-suffix: Tamil *-t*. No; *t* and *k* do not interchange in Dravidian. This suffix corresponds to the Kui multiplex-suffix *-k*; in northern Dravidian it happened to be restricted to the past tense (AJP 50. 149).

kadīm "grain": Balūchi *kadīma*. No; the Balūchi word is from Brāhui *kadīm*, which is from Balūchi *gandīm* "wheat," illustrating the general Dravidian unvoicing of initial occlusives.

kah-, past *kask* "die": Malto *kei-*, past *ketšk-*. The basis is apparently **ge* or **gei*, past **gec*, perhaps derived from Austric **goit* (AJP 50. 152); cp. Tamil *pejar* < **picar* < **pitar* = Gōndi *paṭōl* < **polar* < **pudar* "name" (DD § 33).

kalūr "ashes": no et. Gōndi *karū-* "burn"?

kane "me" (dative-accusative): Tamil *ennai* (accusative). The *a* < *e* and weak *e* < *ai* < **as* are normal, but the *k* needs explaining. It corresponds to the *k*-suffix of the Tamil dative *enakku* (AJP 49. 335; DD § 65; BSOS 8. 813). The initial *n* of Kanara *nana* (for older *ena*) came from the plural *nāvu*.

kar-y- "shear": Gōndi *kōrī-*. Perhaps Afghan *xarxāl* "shears" with dissimilation of *x-x* to *k-x*.

kās "wool": Aryan *karpās* "cotton." No; perhaps Persian *kāz* "shears."

kōḍ "hole": Brāhui *kōṇḍ-* "pierce, stab." Rather Balūchi *hōḍ* "hole" blended with Brāhui *kaḍ* "hole."

kun- "eat": Tamil *tin-*. No; perhaps Tamil *un-* blended with Singhalese *ka-*.

xaf "ear": Tamil *cevi*, Kurukh *xəbḏā*. The normal form would be **xau*; *xaf* is based on the plural *xafk*. The ordinary Tamil word is *kātu*, with $\bar{a} < au < ou < eu$, closely connected with Kurukh *xəbḏā*.

xāxar "fire": Kanara *kāj-* "be heated." Rather Balūchi *kḥakhar* "wasp"?

xal "stone": Tamil *kal*. Add Kurukh *xall* "field"; sense thru "boundary-stone" and "field bounded by stones"?

xan- "see": Brāhui *xan* "eye." More closely cognate with Kanara *kāṇ-*, *kaṇ-* "see."

xar "sheep": Brāhui *xazm* "deer" and *xarās* "bull." Rather Kanauri *kar* "sheep."

xarīṇk "eye-water" = "tears": Tamil *kaṇṇīr*. The Tamil word is *kaṇ* + *nīr*. The Brāhui word represents **khaṇ* + **īr* + **kōl* (plural-ending), with **īr* as the older form of *dir* (see above).

xīsun "red": Kanara *ken*, *kēsū*, *kisū*. The base is apparently **khens* or **ghens*. Kittel gives the lengthened form wrongly as *kēsū*; it is really *kēs*, used only before a vowel, where the imaginary *u* cannot be kept. The Kanara *s* is not the ancient *s*, but was taken from *pasu* "green," which has $s < c$.

xō "pot": Brāhui *xāxar* "fire." Hardly. Perhaps Sanskrit *ukha*?

xōlum "wheat": Sanskrit *gōḍhūma*. Yes, but how? Evidently thru **ghōḍūma* or **ghōḍuma*, with normal $x < kh < gh$. Tamil *kōtumai* is from Prākṛit.

xōš- "rub": no et. Perhaps Persian *γōša* "an herb used in washing clothes." In the variant *xōšk-*, *k* corresponds to the Kui multiplex suffix.

xulkun "soft" (*-kun* suffixal): Brāhui *xul-* "fear." No; Afghan *xurīn* "soft."

xutt- "dig": Kurukh *xos-*, *xott-*. The root ends in *s*; *xutt-* < **khust-* and *xott-* < **khost-* are past-stems used for the present.

littšax "mud": Brāhui *littš-* "cling." Perhaps Kanara *kesaR* "mud" ($s < c$) blended with *littš-*.

lumma "mother": no et. Perhaps for **numma* from **enn* "my" and Persian *umm*, or with misdivision of **enn* (BSOS 8. 815).

max- "laugh": Tamil *nak-*. Yes; but *m* from Afghan *mas-* "smile." Add Kurukh *alkh-*, Malto *alx-*.

malxur "daughter-in-law" : Brāhui *maL* "son" and *balyur* "mother-in-law." Add Gōndi *korit̃r*, Kui *kuṛa-miḍa*, Kurukh *xerō* "daughter-in-law," Tamil *korunt̃i* "sister-in-law."

maL "son" : Brāhui *mār* "son." I have assumed above (*huš*-) that secondary *rs* became *š*. A primary *rs* could have made *L* earlier : *maL* < **mars*- before vowel-suffixes, *mār* < **mars* before a pause.

mār "son" : Kanara *maRi*. Basis **marsi*.

masir "daughter" : Brāhui *mār* "son." Rather Gōndi *miār* < **masir*, Kui *mrau* < **mirau* < **miaru* < **masir* "daughter."

maš "hill" : Tamil *malai*. Yes; but not *š* < *l* as Bray assumes. Tamil *malai* < **malas*; Brāhui *maš* < **malš* < **malas*. Primary *ls* made *L* (see *hiL*); secondary *ls* made *š* at a later time.

maš "wash" : Kanara *murugu* "immerse." No; Kanara *mī*- "bathe" and perhaps Tulu *mei*- "pour." Root **meš*.

maun "black" : Kurukh *mōxārō*. The latter is apparently double; cp. Tamil *karu*.

mē "slave" : Kanara *mej* "body." No; Afghan *mrē* "slave."

mir "ewe" : no et. Perhaps Balūchi *mēhar* "flock of sheep."

miš "earth" : Kanara *malar* "sand." Rather Kanara *maṇ* "earth"; basis **maṇš*?

mōL "smoke" : Kurukh *mōsgā*. Bray assumes wrongly that the *L* is not radical. Basis **mōls*.

mōn "front" : southern *mun*. Rather Kanara *mōRe* "face" or Aryan *muha* < *mukha* : *mōn* for **mōr* or **muan*?

muh "front" : root of *mōn*. Final *h* is so unusual in Brāhui that a derivation from Aryan *muha* seems certain.

murū "hare" : Kanara *mola*, Telugu *nosalu*, Gōndi *malā*. The Telugu form is *kundēlu* < **madēl* < **meḍal* < **miḍal*; *ku*- = Tamil *kuti*- "jump." Gōndi has *malōl* < **mola* < **mudal*. The basis was perhaps **miḍal*, which developed thru **miḍal*, **mital*, **mical* to *mucal* in Tamil. Kanara should have **mosal* = Tamil *mucal*; *mola* came from Gōndi. Apparently *murū* is for **murūn* < **malōn*, borrowed from Gōndi, with dissimilation of *l-l* to *l-n*; a change of *-ōn* to *-ūn* and *-ū* would be parallel with Brāhui *t̃* < **ēn* "I."

musi "three" : Tamil *mūnRu*, Tulu *mūdži* [< **mūntri*]. Add Gōndi *mūd̃*, Kui *mūd̃ži* < **mūntri*. The Brāhui development was *musi* < **munt̃ši* < **munt̃ri* < **murunt̃ō*: the root is *mu* or *mū*, kept in the southern tongues; the ending was added from **irañt̃ō* "two" (see *irañt̃*).

ō "that" : Kanara *u*. Rather Singhalese *ō*.

pin "name" : Kanara *pesar*, Tamil *pejar*, Tulu *pudarm*, Telugu *pēru*. Add Gōndi *paṛōl* < **polar* < **pudar* < **pitar*; Kui *paḍa* < **prḍa* < **pudar* < **pular* < **purar* < **pudar* < **pitar*; Parji *pidir*; Kodagu *peda*. Kanara-Tamil develop **picar* < **pitar*; perhaps a similar change is to be seen in the Kurukh-Malto verb *pindž-* (< **picn-* < **pitan-*?). Telugu has *pēru* < **prēr* < **padēr* < **pedar* < **pitar*, apparently showing a close relation of Telugu to Kodagu. Brāhui may have *pin* < **pinna* < **pitna* < **pitan*.
pišši "cat" : southern *pilli*, with *š* < *l*. No; Balūchi *pišī*. Southern *pilli* is from Aryan *billi*.

pūn "white" (-*un* suffixal) : Tamil *vel*. No; Brāhui has *b-* = southern *v-* < *w-*. Evidently *pī-* is from Afghan *spin*; cp. *aṭ* = Kanara *eṣṭu* and *i* = Malto *ēn*.

pūskun "new" : Tamil *putu*, Kanara *posa*. Brāhui and Kanara have *s* < *c* < *tj*.

pūškun "yellow" : southern *pulla* "sour." How?

raṇām- "instruct" : no et. Persian *raṇām* "books."

-*s* suffix of the second person : no et. Probably **isis* from the Dravidian basis **is* "thou" (DD §§ 51, 65).

sī "oil" : no et. Hindi *alsī* "linseed."

sīrōz "musical instrument" : Persian *sih-rūd* "three-stringed." This Persian word should be transcribed *sī-rōd*.

šalāp- "wash" : imitative. Rather Tamil *alam-p*. Basis **šalam-p*.

šūr "clay" : no et. Persian *šul* "mud."

tar- "spin" : Kanara *tirug-* "turn." Rather Balūchi *tar-* "turn."

tēn "self" : southern *tān*. Perhaps thru **tain* from **tāni* = Malto *tāni*, an emphatic form of *tān*.

tī-, present *ēt-* "give" : Kanara *ta-*, Telugu *te-* "bring." No; these belong with Brāhui *hata-* (see above). The root seems to be **et*, partially combined with a word corresponding to Kurukh *ijjā* "here" (AJP 50. 153). The past-stem **etic-* made *tiss* in Brāhui, **cic-* by assimilation elsewhere, whence Kurukh-Malto *tšī-*, Gōndi-Kui *sī* as the present-stems. In the south the past-stem **etit-* develop *thru* **itit-* to *itt-* (kept in Kanara), whence the present-stem *i-* or *ī-*. Savara *tī-* was perhaps taken from Kui before *t* became *c*.

urā "house" : southern *ūr* "town." Rather Gōndi *rō-* < **ruā* < **urā* "house." Kui *ūra* < **urā* "beam" : a loan-word from

Kolarian, cp. Kurku *urā* "house." Gōndi *rōn* is an old locative used for the nominative.

EDWIN H. TUTTLE.

Washington, D. C.

The Mahābhārata. For the first time critically edited by VISHNU S. SUKTHANKAR. Ādiparvan: Fascicule 7. Poona: BHANDARKAR ORIENTAL RESEARCH INSTITUTE, 1933. Pp. 881-997 + cviii.

This concluding fascicule of Book 1 of the great critical edition of the Sanskrit epic contains: (1) An appendix of nearly 100 pages presenting all passages of the mss. of Book 1 which the editor regards as unoriginal and which (chiefly because of their great length) were unsuitable for presentation in the critical notes at the bottom of the pages of the text itself; (2) a shorter appendix quoting all the Sanskrit passages (except single words and some brief phrases) included in the Javanese Mbh., with a concordance showing their occurrence in the chief editions of the Sanskrit; (3) Addenda et Corrigenda (including many important critical remarks, in part prompted by reviews of earlier fascicules); (4) editorial "Prolegomena" to the entire work, in 110 pages.

This last part is of crucial and overwhelming importance. Here the editor begins by describing his manuscript material. About 70 mss. were examined, and about 60 actually used, for the text of Book 1 (out of 235 of this book known to exist). They are all scientifically described and critically evaluated. On their basis the several recognizable recensions are carefully distinguished; their interrelations and their varying degrees of importance for the constitution of the text are discussed with the utmost intelligence and acumen, and in a manner which to this reviewer seems wholly conclusive. There follows an equally valuable and convincing discussion of the critical methods employed in constituting the text. This necessarily involves some polemics; for there have not been wanting editors who have deliberately chosen other principles, nor even sceptics who have doubted the possibility of a real "critical edition" of the Mbh. at all. Whatever opinion one may hold on the questions at issue, all will agree in commending Sukthankar for his good temper, moderation, and objectivity.

For myself, I have already, in reviews of earlier fascicules (see particularly JOURNAL 52.252 ff.), gone much farther than this; and now, after studying the editor's first complete statement of his case, I see no reason to modify what I have said before. On the contrary, it seems to me now scarcely possible for an open-minded and well-informed Śanskritist to question, any longer, the tremendous value of the undertaking, nor the brilliant success of the performance. (Few such persons, I may add, have questioned these matters even previously.) The work, as the author clearly says, is not, "anything like the autograph copy of the work of its mythical author, Maḥarṣi Vyāsa. It is not, in any sense, a reconstruction of the Ur-Maḥābhārata . . . that ideal but impossible desideratum. . . . It is but a modest attempt to present a version of the epic as old as the extant manuscript material will permit us to reach with some semblance of confidence." To which an honest and informed reviewer can only add that this "modest attempt" has been conspicuously successful.

The entire edition of the Ādi-parvan (Book 1) contains 881 large pages of text and critical apparatus (the latter at the foot of the pages), plus over a hundred pages of Appendices and over a hundred of Prolegomena. The work was begun, I believe, about 1924. The first of the seven parts appeared in 1927, the last in 1933. Considering the magnitude and difficulty of the task, this record shows amazing speed and efficiency, of which any scholar in the world might well be proud. The printing is well done; type and paper are good, and misprints relatively very few. In every respect, therefore, this monumental work will reflect the utmost credit on its editor and his assistants, and on the great Indian people who may justly regard it as a matter of national pride. To be sure this is only a comparatively small part of the text of the Mbh.; and, very wisely, Sukthankar has abandoned any attempt to carry the vast task to completion alone. Other editors, including at least one very distinguished European Śanskritist, are understood to be editing later books, and some of these, I am informed, are nearly completed. Dr. Sukthankar will, of course, retain a general supervising editorship of the whole; this is a guarantee that there will be no falling off in the high standard set by the first book.

When completed, this edition of the Maḥābhārata will occupy a place in the history of Śanskrit scholarship with which only one

other work—the lexicon of Boehtlingk and Roth—can hope to vie in magnitude and importance.

Études de grammaire sanskrite. Première série. Par LOUIS RENOU.
Paris: ADRIEN-MAISONNEUVE, 1936. Pp. 145.

We have learned to expect from Professor Renou models of what grammatical studies should be. He is profoundly learned, without being pedantic; keen and penetrating in interpretation, without being hair-splitting or fantastic; severely businesslike, not afraid of strict attention to scholarly technique, and yet always interesting. It is to be hoped that the series here inaugurated will be long continued.

This volume contains three monographs. The first, on the form and syntax of participles, is divided into three sections, on the Brāhmaṇas, post-Vedic Sanskrit, and the Rīgveda, in this order. "Participles" here means the forms in *-a(n)t-* and *-(m)āna-*, and in (perfect) *-vāns-*; what we in English call "perfect (or past) passive participles" in *-ta-* and *-na-* are not included. The study is full of acute and valuable observations and deserves the careful study of all Sanskritists. It is not easy to summarize its results briefly; a few running comments will perhaps suggest its variety and interest, while incorporating one or two points which occurred to me during the reading. § 5: the future pple. is used (in the Br.) periphrastically with the copula, but in a sense different from that of the finite future. § 6 (and passim): the pple. (in the Br.) is generally definitely "verbal" and often acquires the function of a subordinate clause (temporal, causal, concessive, etc.); in two-thirds of these cases it is nom., in almost all the rest accus. (in apposition to subject or object respectively). § 13: it often carries the "real verbal content," the finite form being no more than an auxiliary, most commonly, to my surprise and interest, a form of the root *i* "to go." § 22: altho perhaps most western Sanskritists would agree with Renou, I cannot believe that *jīvanmṛta-* and *upaśusyadāndra-* and the like are dvandvas. It is an old moot point; but I prefer to follow the Hindu grammarians and interpret this type as *karmadhārayas* ("dead while still living," "moist or fresh while in the process of withering"). § 23: I do not feel

udāsina- as "wholly adjectivized"; it started, I believe, as a technical term of the Arthaśāstra, where it is certainly a substantive ("a mighty and disinterested neutral power"); Renou recognizes this use but apparently thinks it secondary. § 25: Buddhistic Skt. has forms of several of the types quoted here: Saddh. P. 295. 5 *niṣīdhiyāno* (suffix *-āna-* from thematic pres.); Lal. V. 7. 2 *praviṣṭamānasya* (ending of pres. mid. pple. added to perf. pass. pple. stem). § 31, end: I think the genitive absolute, with both pres. pples. and other forms, is not so rare in Buddhistic Skt. as Renou says. Cf. Lal. V. 177. 4, *vidiṣo diṣa sarva* (so read for Lefmann's *diṣi sarvi*) *mārgato nāgati nāsyā gatiś ca lābhyate*, "tho he seek in all cardinal and semi-cardinal directions, neither his (Buddha's) coming nor going is found." § 32: the absolute use of the instr. in Buddh. Skt. is denied (against Sen). But a better example than Sen's, and one which I find it hard to construe otherwise than as strictly "absolute," is Lal. V. 119. 11 (prose): *sarvair varṇaiḥ* (so read, or omit *varṇaiḥ*) *stutimaṅgalaiḥ pratyupasthitair*, "all (praises,) lauds and benedictions having been presented." § 37: a case of what Renou calls "nom. absolute" of the pple. is found in Lal. V. 125. 16: (*tatra dhātṛyaś ca ceṭivargāś ca sthāpitā abhūvan, pariśeṣāḥ*) *śākyaḥ śuddhodanapramukhāḥ prakrāmantah*.

The second monograph is on the position of "accessory words" in the Rīgveda; that is what Bloomfield used to call "light words"; Renou coins the term "mots seconds," since (as was already shown by Delbrück) they tend strongly to be placed precisely second in the clause. He proves that enclisis in the strict sense, lack of tonic accent, has nothing to do with this, since many such words are accented, while conversely some unaccented words (vocatives, non-subordinate verbs) show no such tendency. He calls this tendency to second position "enclise de phrase," as distinguished from "enclise de mot," enclisis proper. In the Rīgveda, of course, while "second place" may mean second place in a grammatical sentence or clause, it most often means second place in a *pāda*. Even when, for one reason or another, the "mot second" is removed from that position, it is apt to become the second (practically never the first!) word after the cesura in the triṣṭubh-jagati meter. The intimate connection of the "mot second," even if it has an accent of its own, with the preceding word is indicated by several facts. Thus cerebralization operates

from one to the other, as if they were a single word (§ 30). Further, if an ordinarily initial word, such as a preverb or the negative *mā*, to which "mots seconds" are generally attached, be transferred to the middle of the verse, the "mot second" is very apt to be taken along with it; that is, the two stick together as a unit (§§ 17 ff.).

There are many other interesting observations in this study, as well as in the third monograph, on the "innovations" of the grammar of Candra or Candragomin (the Cāndravākaraṇa), which is the favorite Sanskrit grammar of Kashmir and other Buddhist regions, including Tibet. Renou examines in detail all its peculiar rules, and undertakes to define its relation to both older and later grammars. Tho based largely on the Pāṇinean tradition, Candra(gomin) departs from it in some important respects, and shows some clear signs of adaptation to the "freer, more popular Sanskrit" of the epics, Purāṇas, and story-collections. It is interesting to note that even at this relatively late date, Sanskrit grammar was not, or not wholly, dependent on tradition in a slavishly pedantic way, but observed real linguistic facts. There are also in Candra a few traces of relation to Buddhistic Sanskrit, but chiefly in vocabulary and not nearly so many as might be expected in a Buddhist work: an indication of "the progress of linguistic brahmanization of cultivated Buddhist circles." Later grammarians, even of the Pāṇinean school, show in turn the influence of Candra(gomin). His date is a matter of dispute; Renou adds nothing new on this point, but inclines to accept Sylvain Lévi's date (late 7th century) rather than Liebich's earlier one.

Vergleichendes und etymologisches Wörterbuch des Alt-Indoarischen (Altindischen). Von WALTHER WÜST. Lieferung 1-3. Heidelberg: WINTER, 1935. Pp. 208.

If and when completed, this will be probably the most elaborate etymological dictionary of any single Indo-European language (except perhaps the projected new edition of Walde's Latin). It is estimated that it will contain over 1,000 pages; the pages are fairly large, and the type exceedingly small. Only the last twelve pages of this instalment contain the beginnings of the dictionary

proper. They present only three complete articles, on the pronominal stem *a-*, the verb-augment *a-*, and the negative prefix *a(n)-*; with part of a fourth, on the interjection *a* (not found in the literature). On the basis of this very scanty material it is impossible now to form a definitive judgment of the quality of the work. It is, however, already evident that it is bound to have very great value for all Indo-Europeanists, at least bibliographically, and as collectanea. The value of its original and critical contributions can not be estimated until more of it has appeared; there are some disquieting indications which suggest that it may be less impressive. But certainly every worker in Indic or Indo-European etymology will have to keep the book at his elbow, if only as a comprehensive survey of work in the field to date.

The principles adopted by the author in deciding what words to include are stated on p. 55 ff. (cf. also p. 30). In general they seem to me sound; *mutatis mutandis*, they are about the same as Walde's (in his Latin). Evidently the intention is to include all words and forms which could conceivably be sought in such a work. While obvious noun compounds are of course excluded in general, some are included for "cultural-historical" (*kṛta-yuga*) or other reasons. On p. 199 f., under the pronominal stem *a-*, each of the individual case-forms derived from that stem receives separate treatment, with quotation of their specific correspondents in other languages; a praiseworthy and useful procedure which will, I take it, naturally not be extended to declensional forms of noun stems, unless in exceptional cases. I miss in this article any reference to the instr. sg. *enā* (*ena*), which by most scholars (such as Grassmann, Whitney, Geldner, Macdonell, and impliedly Neisser, since he does not correct Grassmann) has been connected with the stem *a-*, and which, at least in many of its occurrences, I still think certainly belongs there rather than with the stem *ena-*, despite Wackernagel III pp. 521, 524. (Note on the latter page the correct statement that *enā* is parallel in use with the instr. sg. fem. *ayā*, which can only be from the stem *a-*!) Even if Wüst follows Wackernagel in connecting these forms with the stem *ena-*, he should have mentioned them here with a cross-reference, in view of the usual opinion, the abandonment of which seems to me one of the rare faults in Wackernagel's masterpiece.

Under the negative *a(n)-*, p. 204, Wüst refers in what seems to

me a naive way to the fact (which he considers "merkwürdig") that Pali commentators assign the meaning "great" to this element in some compounds, reminding him of the German *Unmenge* etc.; he winds up with the query "Zufall?" An examination of the Pali cases alleged, taken from Andersen-Smith, *Critical Pali Dictionary*, p. 1, should have shown Wüst that the Pali commentators' statement is silly and worthless. The instances are *appamāṇa* (Skt. *a-pramāṇa*), "having no measure, immeasurable" (but interpreted as "of great measure"); *a-sek(k)ha*, "not needing (any longer) to be trained, adept," opposite of *sek(k)ha* ("needing training," approximately "novice") but interpreted (foolishly) as "great (advanced) novice," i. e. "adept"; and *asaṃvara*, which is quoted only from Samantapāsādikā 22.8, where the actual form is *saṃvarāsaṃvara*-, a formation of the type (well known in Pali) of *phalāphala*, "all manner of fruits," and meaning "all manner of *saṃvara*." Neither in these nor in any other Indic occurrence does *a(n)*- have any meaning that is not simply and obviously based on the negative. No doubt the German *Un*-(menge etc.) is also derivable from that meaning; but Wüst's suggestion that a development similar to it took place in Indic is baseless.¹

Certainly the strongest point in Wüst's work is the detailed recording of previous treatments of each word or form, with enormous bibliographies. Some may think that he goes too far in dragging in antiquated and long-since exploded theories. But for myself, I am glad to have collected and indexed in one place the etymological speculations of early scholars. I even agree with Wüst (p. 30 ff.) that it is unsafe to assume that they can have only historic value for us. To be sure, he sometimes wastes too many words in proving the obvious, or disproving the obviously wrong. But the listing of all half-way respectable theories, or theories which passed as such in relatively modern times, is not in my opinion a waste of space. And Wüst, who has had a good deal of experience in bibliography, has thus earned the gratitude of the

¹ The explanation of *Un*-(menge etc.) does not really concern us; but it is doubtless an analogical extension from cases where the negative meant approximately "no (ordinary sort of) specimen (of the entity in question)," as e. g. *Un-tier*, "no (ordinary sort of) animal," "monstrous animal," which may easily be felt as meaning "monstrously large animal." So my colleague Professor Eduard Prokosch interprets such forms. They are in any case certainly late developments and have no bearing on IE.

present reviewer, who greatly prefers to have bibliographical collections made by somebody else.² Wüst even goes pretty far (see Vorrede, p. 84 f.) in including references to "glottogonic" theories connecting IE. with other families of languages. The writings of such men as Trombetti, and even Herman Wirth, are, he tells us, exploited for Sanskrit etymologies. How far it is really useful to go in including such things is a serious question. Wüst draws the line at the "Japhetic" school of Marr, which he excludes from consideration and stigmatizes, rather curiously, as "marxistisch-materialistisch" (p. 85). I am no advocate of Marr's views. But I wonder (1) whether they are really more wild than Trombetti's or Wirth's (I should think the advantage, if any, was the other way); (2) whether there is any other reason for characterizing them as "marxistisch-materialistisch" than the fact that Marr lived in Russia, and possibly the further fact that Marr's substratum-theory is presumably uncongenial to views which are now in favor in German governmental circles; and (3) whether, if the answer to the last question is negative, political vituperation has a place in scientific works. Could not other organs be found for demonstrating publicly the author's political orthodoxy?³

² I should have written the conventional statement that he seems to have "spared no pains" to make his work bibliographically complete, but for the following strange remark, which occurs (in substance) several times in his "Schriftenverzeichniss" (e.g. after Hehn's *Kulturpflanzen und Haustierte*, Hübschmann's *Das indogermanische Vocalsystem*, and Schrader's *Sprachvergleichung und Urgeschichte*): "Die Verantwortung für die Benutzung dieses Werkes muss ich Herrn C. C. Uhlenbeck überlassen." This puzzles me. Apparently Wüst has not used these standard works for his book; this surmise is confirmed by the fact that he encloses the titles in brackets. But on what ground does he blame Uhlenbeck for these omissions? Has Uhlenbeck cornered all copies of these books in Germany, and smuggled them into Holland, or burned them?

³ Another curious fact calls for comment in this connection. Wüst (p. 85) says that he knows Marr's theories only from some "confused" publications of the Viennese R. Bleichsteiner. A much better and more authoritative source, well-known to scholars generally (can it have been unknown to Wüst, who is so justly proud of his bibliographical knowledge?), would have been *Japhetitische Studien* . . . von F. Braun und N. Marr. I. *Die Urbevölkerung Europas und die Herkunft der Germanen*. Von Friedrich Braun. (1922.) II. *Der japhetitische Kaukasus*. Von Nikolaus Marr. Aus dem Russischen übersetzt von F. Braun. (1923.) These books bear Marr's imprimatur, and were published by the celebrated German publishing house of W. Kohlhammer (Berlin, Stuttgart, and Leipzig); one is

There are not a few indications that Wüst himself is greatly interested in "glottogonic" speculations. Not very reassuring as to his method is the following dictum (p. 199), for which he is proud to claim personal credit, as indicated by an appended "(W.)": "Es gilt die möglicherweise weittragende Proportion: á-(pron.) : tá-(pron.) = tatá-, m. 'Vater' : attā [lex.], f. 'Mutter.'" (The order of terms is Wüst's.) I am afraid he has read Trombetti and Wirth with too much sympathy.

A considerable part of the Vorrede is taken up with a monographic study of the ἄπαξ λεγόμενον *cākšmā* (RV. 2.24.9), which is offered by the author as a sample of his method in original investigation. He argues for connection with *cakṣ-(us, etc.)*, and particularly with Av. *čašman* "eye," and makes out a good case, so far (tho after unnecessary waste of words in disproving older views). His own evidence, however, seems to me to support a rendering "characterized by (intellectual) vision, i. e. by insight, wisdom" (cf. *matī* in the same verse), rather than "zum (Himmels-)Auge in Beziehung stehend, im Kampf um das Himmels-auge," which introduces a speculative and doubtful notion. More important for Wüst's method is the use he makes of this interpretation to prove "eine indo-iranische Dialekt-Isoglosse." Since this isolated and obscure word occurs in the second book of the RV., he argues for special Iranian relations with that book. In support of this, he quotes another ἄπαξ λεγόμενον of the same book, the proper name *dībhika*, 2.14.3—"schon längst" identified with the Iranian tribal name *Derbikes*. Considering the wearisome verbosity with which elsewhere Wüst proves the most self-evident truisms, one is somewhat surprised to find in this case no attempt at proof whatever. He is content to say: "Die Gleichung ist evident. Ich erspare es mir, Literatur zu nennen." From this the unwary reader would suppose, at the very least, that the identification was universally accepted by scholars. The fact is that quite the opposite is the case. The sole occurrence of the word is in the singular; most scholars have thought it a personal rather than a tribal name, and at least as apt to refer to a demon as to a human being (so PW., pw., Grassmann, Geldner's *Glossar*, Bergaigne

a translation of Marr's own work. It is strange that Wüst should know of Marr only thru the writings of an Austrian with a Jewish-sounding name (evidence of "Marxism and materialism"?).

2. 220, Macdonell *VMyth.* 162, Macdonell and Keith's *Vedic Index*. Ludwig (RV. III, p. 207) says of it "wol . . . volksname, erinnert an die *Δεσβικες*" (note however the cautious "wo[h]l"; very different from Wüst's dogmatism); and Hillebrandt (*VMyth.*² I, p. 508) implies acceptance of the equation; neither of them presents any argument, and I have found no other scholar who accepts what Wüst asserts is "evident." To most open-minded scholars it is likely to appear quite speculative, and of no evidential value. This is a sample of Wüst's way of arguing; others like it could be quoted. The less he says in proof of an assertion, the more dubious it may be assumed to be.—It is likely enough that Indo-Iranian had a word **cakṣman* "eye," preserved in Avestan, and that the isolated *cākṣmā* is a derivative of it; but its otherwise total disappearance in Indic does not go far towards proving an isogloss between Iranian and the particular book of the RV. where that word chances to occur. There are too many *ἀναξ λεγόμενα* in all parts of the RV.; and all efforts to prove geographic distinctions between the family books of the RV. have failed, in my opinion.

The Vorrede is unnecessarily long and verbose. It contains (p. 48 f.) an unconvincing attempt to justify his adoption of the term "Alt-Indoarisch" instead of the well-established "Altindisch."⁴ Aside from this and the passages referred to above, I find little in it which could not have been spared without loss, and in many cases with positive gain, to the scholarly value of the work. His references to previous workers in the same field show bad taste, to put it mildly. C. C. Uhlenbeck is the author of the only alphabetically complete etymological dictionary of Sanskrit now in exist-

⁴ On the ground that not all languages spoken in India have been or are "Indic" in the linguistic sense. On the same ground he would have to say "Italo-Arisch" instead of "Italisch," "Franco-Romance" instead of "French" (the Breton and Basque languages are also spoken by Frenchmen), and so on. It would be hard to find any established linguistic term derived from a geographical name which we should not have to abandon, since few indeed must be the countries or provinces where only languages of a single linguistic stock have been spoken historically. Some people find great satisfaction in replacing simple terms, which every one understands, by complicated and awkward neologisms. The Hindus, centuries ago, knew better than to trouble themselves with such pedantic logomachies. They knew that *rūḍhi*, conventionally established usage, is more important than *yoga*, etymological meaning. See my *Mīmāṃsā Nyāya Prakāśa*, Glossarial Index, under these two words.

ence. He is more a general linguist than a Sanskritist, and he made no great claims for his book; he modestly describes it as an "anspruchslose arbeit . . . ein bequemes handbuch für den for-scher, . . . das ihn zu weiteren untersuchungen anregt." It is all that this implies, and more. That it is not free from errors and omissions, some of which might have been avoided, does not justify or excuse Wüst's peevish and ill-natured disdain. Many thousands of words are spent in an impassioned account of Wüst's personal quarrel with the late Jarl Charpentier. Many thousands more are devoted to a minute description of the mechanics of his working-room, with amazing details of the different colors and precise measurements of the record-cards used, size and material of boxes for their storing, and other similar matters, which will interest few, unless future biographers of Professor Wüst. It is rare to find a scholarly writer who thinks it necessary to give such complete information about his private life and personal habits. Yet occasionally one notes strange reticences. For instance, on p. 4 Wüst mentions as one of his own works "die durch Dankesschuld als selbstverständliche Pflicht gebotene Herausgabe des hinterlassenen zweiten Bandes der *Vedischen Mythologie* Alfred Hillebrandts." I was surprised by this, and imagine that others may find it equally surprising. For in my copy of the book referred to, the "Vorwort" is signed by L. Scherman, and states that, in accordance with Hillebrandt's wish, the publisher entrusted to *him* (Professor Scherman) the editing of the book, a task which he says he undertook, as a pious duty towards his dead teacher and friend. He refers with "hearty thanks" to certain assistance given him in this labor by Dr. Wüst. Professor Scherman's name is not once mentioned by Professor Wüst, either in the passage quoted, or (I believe) anywhere else in the work under review.

The concluding paragraph (p. 124) of the Vorrede takes pains to declare that the author has been wholly disinterested and honorable in his work, and has not been influenced by personal ambition ("sonder Rücksicht auf Geld und Zeit, Klique, Konkurrenz und Karriere-Machen"). Most scholars do not think it necessary to make such assertions; it would not occur to many of them that they might be suspected of motives of the kind which Wüst disclaims.

FRANKLIN EDGERTON.

Yale University.

A History of Indian Literature. By MAURICE WINTERNITZ, Ph. D.
Vol. II. *Buddhist Literature and Jain Literature.* Translated
from the original German by Mrs. S. Ketkar and Miss E.
Kohn, B. A., and revised by the author. Calcutta: UNIVERSITY
OF CALCUTTA. 1933.

The first half of Vol. II of Prof. Winternitz's *Geschichte der Indischen Literatur*, which treated Buddhist literature, was finished in 1912; and the second half, which treated Jain literature, was finished in 1920. Naturally, much new material had accumulated between those dates and 1932, the date of the latest additions to this edition, which made a complete revision desirable.

The publications on Buddhism during the intervening twenty years seem to have been well covered, though it is surprising to find no mention of the late D. B. Spooner's work.

The Jains, both Śvetāmbars and Digāmbars, are now extremely active in publishing their texts and it is almost impossible to keep in touch with all the new volumes as they appear. A number of publications previously omitted, as well as new ones, are included in this edition. Also, a number of corrections and revisions of opinion—for the better—have been made. There are still some statements to which I would take exception. Prof. Winternitz (p. 432) says that "according to the tradition of the Śvetāmbara Jainas themselves, the authority of their sacred texts does not go beyond the 5th century A. D." It is surely unreasonable to say that the Jain sacred texts date only from the council at Vallabhi, much less to say that "Jain tradition" supports that view. Indeed, the author himself proceeds to contradict the statement, so far as tradition is concerned, and admits that an earlier date must be conceded for most of the canon. The Jains themselves do not claim that all the canon originated at an early date, but there is no reason whatever to dispute their tradition that parts of it were composed by Mahāvīra's disciples.

Another statement that *should* have been revised, is only slightly modified—namely, that the Jain sacred texts are much "drier" and less interesting than the Buddhist texts. Whether something is interesting or not is purely subjective, but Prof. Winternitz himself gives various extracts and résumés which show a decided human interest; and the Buddhist canon certainly has as much tiresome repetition and uninteresting detail.

Notwithstanding the numerous items that have been added, some important ones have been overlooked, e. g. the *Pañcāśakagrantha* (Bhavnagar 1912), which has much valuable information and is considered authoritative. Nemicaandra's *Pravacanasāroddhāra* (Devchand Lalbhai Fund series, 1922-26) is barely referred to in a footnote, though it is an invaluable work of reference. Many of the editions cited by Winternitz are out of print, and in some cases later editions have been overlooked. The *Lokaprakāśa* is being published by the DLF (= Winternitz, DPU), beginning in 1926. The *Prasāraśabhā* edition (and also the Baroda one) of the *Karmagranthas* has long been unobtainable, but now the *Ātmānandasabhā* has a new edition of the first four books (1934). Their edition of the *Kalpasūtra* might also be mentioned. The *Ātmānandasabhā* should have been included in the societies active in publishing (p. 427 n). The *Āgamodayasamiti* edition of the *Jñātādharmaśāstra* has long been out of print, but the *Prasāraśabhā* has brought out a very good edition with a Gujarātī commentary (1928-29). The *Āgamodayasamiti* series is no longer published in Mehsana, but in Bombay.

The discussion of the non-canonical Jain literature, both early and late, has been much expanded with a more just appraisal of its value and extent, and of the really great interest of its fiction. It is gratifying to the reviewer that Prof. Winternitz seems to have changed his opinion that the *Triṣaṣṭiśālākāpuruṣacaritra* can be of interest only to "pious Jains."

In appendices the author discusses the dates of the deaths of Buddha and Mahāvīra and comes to the only possible conclusion—that they are entirely uncertain and that nothing can be proved. But it is puzzling to know why he considers the traditional date of Vīra's death, 527 B. C., "as difficult to reconcile with the one and only firmly established fact, namely that Buddha and Mahāvīra were contemporaries and lived in the reigns of Kings Bimbisāra and Ajātaśatru, as they are with other traditions of the Jains themselves." The date 527 B. C. does conflict with other Jain dates, but there is no difficulty about making Buddha and Vīra contemporaries of these two kings, and many chronologists do so, and retain the date 527 B. C.

The translators are to be commended for their success in a work that involved many technical terms which are usually well rendered. On p. 463 "*vollendeter Weiser (kevalin)*" is mistranslated

"accomplished sage." Perhaps due to the fact that the author himself did not read the proof, some errors in the references have slipped in, e. g. p. 507 n, the Bloomfield volume was published in 1920, not 1930; and JAOS 45 should read AJP 45.

This volume, like its predecessors, is indispensable to Indologists.

HELEN M. JOHNSON.

Fayetteville, Ark.

Chinese Art. Edited by LEIGH ASHTON. London: KEGAN PAUL, TRENCH, TRUBNER, 1935. 111 pp; 24 plates.

This excellent little volume was written for the exhibition of Chinese art held last year at Burlington House by the Royal Academy. Some observers have said that the book is better than the exhibition itself. It contains an introduction and an article on painting by Lawrence Binyon, one on sculpture and lacquer by Leigh Ashton, on the potter's art by R. L. Hobson, on bronzes by A. J. Koop, on jades by Una Pope-Hennessy, and on textiles by Leigh Ashton. There is a chronological table and a selected bibliography, but no index, and Chinese characters are not given. Written for visitors to the exhibition, it is naturally popular in style, but the well-known authorities who have contributed articles have given a compact, historical account of the development of Chinese art which is surprisingly inclusive, and charmingly written.

The Twin Pagodas of Zayton. By G. ECKE and P. DEMIÉVILLE. Cambridge: HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS, 1935. viii + 95 pages; 72 plates.

Zayton, a word which has been brought into English as "satin," was the name used by Marco Polo and other medieval travellers for a great seaport of southeastern China. For some time its location was disputed, but it has now been established that it is to be identified with the modern Ch'üan-chou in the province of Fu-chien. Marco Polo called it one of the two greatest havens in the world of commerce, and Ibn Baṭṭāḥ said that its harbour was the greatest in the world. Its glory was at its height at the beginning

of the 13th century. Today, the pervading odour of incense which is still produced there, the inscribed Arabic tomb slabs, two famous ancient Buddhist monasteries, the remains of Hindu and Nestorian sanctuaries, a great mosque, and traces of Manichaeism, show its ancient cosmopolitan character.

The foundations of the first of the two pagodas were laid in 1228, and they were finished in 1250. The pagodas are built of massive blocks of granite, in a wooden style, current during the Sung period, whose principles have long been forgotten in China. The study gives an account of this style of architecture in technical language.

Eighty panels with life-sized figures carved in middle relief are inserted into the ashlar construction. The panels carved in soft greenstone on the base of the eastern tower show a knowledge of classical Buddhism and of the traditional conventions of Chinese Buddhist imagery. But as the towers are ascended, the types become more and more corrupt, and many seem to have been invented by the carvers. Consequently they throw light on the popular Buddhism of southern China during the Sung period, since the granite carvings appear to be the work of local artists.

The number of Arhats is eighteen, not sixteen as in the T'ang period. Avalokiteśvara is already associated with a child, or appears as a woman. Hsüan-tsang, Bodhidharma, Liang Wu-ti, and the monk Pu-tai, who became identified with Maitreya, are pictured. There are no Tantric figures, indicating that by the end of the Sung period, Tantrism, which had long flourished at the Imperial Court, had not yet affected the masses of southern China.

The authors of this volume have produced a critical and scholarly work in keeping with their high reputations. It is valuable for the study of Chinese architecture, sculpture, and religion. The plates are splendid, and there are plans of the structures. Chinese characters, a bibliography and critical notes are given, but there is no index. The format might have been made more attractive. Full acknowledgment is made to the unfinished notes of Chavannes, and, what is not always done, to the missionaries and Chinese who assisted in the work.

Les "Siao-ha(i-eu)-lyu" de Pékin; un essai sur la poésie populaire en Chine. By WITOLD JABLOŃSKI. Kraków: POLSKA AKADEMJA UMIEJĘTNOŚCI, 1935. 193 pages.

Perhaps the most valuable and reliable of the Chinese Classics is the *Book of Odes*. It consists largely of folk-songs, which Confucius considered of great importance. The Chinese were interested in such folk-poetry until the middle of the Western Han period, when Ssu-ma Hsiang-ju set the style of cultured and refined poetry, impossible except to a highly-educated man, which has in general remained the standard almost to the present. With a few exceptions like Ch'iu Ta-chün and Li T'iao-yüan, Chinese scholars since the Han have not been interested in popular poetry. The great interest in folklore and popular poetry now noticeable in China is largely due to foreign stimulus. Eitel, de Vitale, and P. van Oest made collections, but the chief stimulus came from a younger generation of Chinese scholars who were familiar with the importance attached to folklore in the West. Liu Fu, Chou Tso- jen, and others founded a society for the study of popular poetry in 1917. In 1922, a review dealing with folklore, the *Ko-yao-chou-kan* was begun. Among others, Chang Hui, Ku Chieh-kang, and Chao Yüan-jen have made valuable contributions.

Children's songs offer much material to the scholar interested in folk-lore and linguistics. The present volume is a study of a large collection of such songs current in Peip'ing. It is issued as No. 19 of the *Mémoires* of the Oriental Commission of the Polish Academy. Pan Jablonski did not collect the songs himself, but has used collections of four other investigators one of whom worked especially for him. In addition to this man, a Chinese named T'ong, he has used volumes by Vitale (1896), Kinchen Johnson (1932), and Mme. Siue-jou (1928, 1930), which give a total of about 800 different songs. It is interesting that the catalogue of Liu Fu names 4103 Pekinese pieces. Jablonski's work consists of two parts. The first analyses the prosody, poetry, vocabulary and themes of the songs. The second gives the romanized text and translations. Jablonski's text is in French, but there is a summary in Polish. There is also a concordance, and an index of Chinese characters. The latter is not convenient for use, and was probably placed at the end of the book in order to avoid expense, but the Chinese of the songs is so simple and the French transla-

tion so clear, that there is little need to consult the index. The whole work is carefully and critically done, and should be used as a model for further investigations. Unless these are made quickly, much folk-lore may disappear and be lost because of the rapid modernization of China.

The Oracle Bones from Honan. By GEORGE BOUNAKOFF. Leningrad-Moscow: ACADEMY OF SCIENCES OF THE U. S. S. R., 1935. 107 pages.

This monograph is the first study of the subject which has appeared in Russian, and is published as Vol. 3 of the transactions of the Marr Institute of Language and Mentality. While the text is in Russian, there are summaries in Chinese and English, and the titles in the bibliography are given in the original languages, which include Chinese, Japanese, French, German, and English.

The work is divided into three parts. The first part gives the history of the Anyang relics and the problems arising from them. The author considers the authenticity of some of the relics as relatively unimportant, since the forgeries are carefully copied from genuine inscriptions, but few scholars will agree with him on this point. He criticizes the school of Lo Chen-yü for its method of deciphering the inscriptions which he claims consists of the mere comparison of deciphered signs with similar signs in the *Shuo wen* and inscriptions on bronze, although it is hard to see what else could have been done. This method, he thinks, does not sufficiently emphasize the moments of development, and the peculiar features of the epoch to which the deciphered signs belong. The author applies the theory of language developed by N. J. Marr, and finds in the history of the term *wang* 王 a "functional semantic change." The term was first used for leadership in the hunting hordes, then shows a differentiation between temporal and sacred powers (clan elders and shamans), and finally a further differentiation between the civil and military powers of the clan elders, becoming a term for military leader. It follows that *wang* should be translated "military leader" when it appears on the relics, and not "king," since the idea of kingship associated with the sign is the development of a latter epoch. This is interesting, but whether it rests on firm evidence is another matter.

The second part gives some details of the collection of relics at the Institute of Book, Document, and Writing, which consists of 199 objects.

The third part will probably be of more value to American scholars, most of whom are not familiar with Russian. It consists of the author's index, a bibliography, and a subject index of seventy-two topics. The Academia Sinica has published a similar bibliography up to 1932. In the bibliography, there are 282 titles of books and articles dealing with the Anyang relics. This is especially valuable because of the large number of articles listed, including those in Chinese, Japanese, European, and American periodicals. The lists have been thoroughly made, although the work of Dr. Creel appears to have been too recent to be included. Although the monograph might be criticized by those who disagree with the prevailing evolutionary, or one might say Morganatic, ideas of scholarship in the USSR in this general field, it is conscientious, thorough, and a contribution to an important subject.

Memoirs of the Research Department of the Toyo Bunko, No. 4.

Edited by KURAKICHI SHIRATORI. Tokyo: THE TOYO BUNKO, 1929. 166 pages, 1 plate, 3 maps.

The Research Department of the Oriental Library (Toyo Bunko) has published four series of monographs of research material. The first, and larger, series is in Japanese. The second, of which this volume is No. 4, is written in European languages. The third and fourth series are miscellaneous, the third being in Japanese, and the fourth in European languages. These series include work of great value to students of Japanese and Chinese culture, and cover a wide variety of subjects.

This volume contains three historical and ethnological studies of importance. The first, by Kurakichi Shiratori, is on "The Queue among the Peoples of North Asia." The author shows that the queue was a feature of the culture of many Central and Eastern Asiatic peoples over a long period of time. These include the Su-shen of the Tunguese race in the Chin period, the Mo-ho in the T'ang, the Nü-chen and the Manchus of the Ming; among the Mongolic race, the Hsiung-nu of the Han age, the T'o-pa, the Juan-juan, and the Shih-wei of the Sung; and among the Turkish

peoples, the T'ieh-le and the T'u-chüeh of the Sui and T'ang periods. The older references from Chinese sources cannot be called conclusive, but make the thesis reasonably probable. The author maintains that the custom of wearing the hair in a queue originated with the ancient Hsiung-nu, and was diffused by them. There are, however, queue wearers in the south, and the paper concludes that there is little chance of securing evidence of a connection between the northern and southern cultures.

The second monograph, by Hiroshi Ikéuchi, is on "The Chinese Expeditions to Manchuria under the Wei Dynasty." The principal source is the dynastic history of the Three Kingdoms, but the Korean history is considered, and shown to misrepresent the facts. The study shows that under the kingdom of Wei large expeditions were sent into Korea and Manchuria, reaching as far north as Nikolisk in Siberia, into regions previously unknown to the Chinese. The record gives considerable information concerning the peoples inhabiting Manchuria in the 3rd Century of our era.

The third monograph is by Sei Wada, and is on "The Philippine Islands as Known to the Chinese before the Ming Period." The Chinese had intercourse with India and other advanced peoples of South-Western Asia as early as the Han period. But because of its inaccessibility, the province of Fu-chien was not developed as rapidly as the district of Kuang-tung, which is farther south. Fu-chien is the natural departing-point on the mainland for Formosa, the Philippines, and Borneo. Consequently the Chinese had knowledge of the localities along the route to India long before they were aware of the islands farther east. In the Ming period, Chang Hsieh (1617) divided the Southern Sea countries into two groups, those in the Eastern, and those in the Western Sea. The former included the Philippines, the Moluccas, and Borneo. It is probable that the former were the countries on an eastern trade route, while the latter were on a western route. Borneo first appears in Chinese records during the Sung period. By identifying the P'i-she-ya of the Sung history with the Visayas of the Philippines, in which the author follows a suggestion of Laufer, the Chinese are shown to have had knowledge of the Philippines during the Sung and Yüan periods.

These three monographs are of great interest and value. While such matters as the identification of ancient place-names and the

cultures of vanished peoples can seldom be established with complete conviction, the theses advanced are sound, and supported by as good evidence as could be expected. The investigations are critical and scholarly.

Monumenta Serica; Journal of Oriental Studies of the Catholic University of Peking. Edited by F. X. BIALLAS. Peiping: VETCH, 1935. 243 pages, 12 plates.

The publication of the first number of a journal such as this is an important event in Sinology. It has received the blessing of Pelliot. Its editor is a well-known scholar who is an authority on the cult of Confucius, and among the associate editors are A. von Stael-Holstein and Gustav Ecke. The journal itself realizes the hopes which such names inspire. There are eight fairly long articles by W. Schmidt, Schierlitz, Creel, Fuchs, Jaworski, von Zach, Biallas, and Bernard, and three brief notes. These are followed by twenty-five book reviews. There is also a section entitled "Review of Reviews" which lists articles in recent issues of the leading journals in Chinese, Japanese, and western languages. This would be still more valuable if brief summaries were given, as well as the titles. Finally there is a list of recent publications.

The Roman Catholic Church has continuously produced scholarly works in Sinology from the time of Gaubil and De Mailla until now, and this present undertaking is a praiseworthy addition to a long list. It is to be regretted that the present generation of Protestant missionaries do not follow in the steps of Legge and Edkins and emulate their Catholic brethren in such matters.

The journal is to be published semi-annually. If future issues continue the high standard of this number, the journal will become a necessity to every sinologist. It is not possible to discuss all the contents, but a few remarks may be made concerning the article by Wilhelm Schmidt on "The Oldest Culture-Circles of Asia."

Father Schmidt, the founder of "Anthropos," is the best known member of the Kultur-Kreis school of ethnologists, and is the author of a number of works, one of which was recently translated into English. One of the characteristics of the school is their method of classifying cultures by means of associated specific cul-

tural traits, followed by a study of the area over which these cultures have spread. This method, and some of its results, have aroused considerable criticism, especially by the French school of Durkheim and Lévy-Bruhl. Fathers Schmidt and Koppers have been accused of coloring their ethnology with their theology, especially with regard to their theory that monotheism was the most primitive form of religion. American ethnologists generally consider Schmidt as accurate in his facts, but as yet there has been no wide-spread acceptance of his series of culture-circles outside his own school. It is generally admitted by ethnologists that he has established the existence of primitive monotheism, though this is conditioned by the definition of monotheism used. Students of the History of Religions still object to his upsetting of their evolutionary theories. While Schmidt has criticized such theories, his own appears to be a modified form of evolution. The present article was originally delivered as a lecture at Göteborg, and has been published at the request of Karlgren. It does not contain new material, but is an excellent summary of the Kultur-Kreis position.

Catalogue des Collections Indochinoises. By PIERRE DUPONT.

Paris: MUSÉES NATIONAUX, 1934. 190 pages, 15 plates.

This catalogue of 272 items in the collections of the Musée Guimet is made under seventeen headings, which naturally fall into the three classes of Khmer, Cam, and Siamese art. The first fifty-eight pages are devoted to analytical studies, which include articles on the schools of Siamese art, by Dupont, on the evolution of Khmer statuary by Stern, and on the chronology of the Champa monuments by Rémusat. There is a table giving the numbering of the items in the museum. The plates are good, and there is a map of the museum. The work of preparing the catalogue has been thoroughly done, even to the extent of giving a bibliography for each item, and the occasions when it has been exhibited outside the museum.

Catalogue of the Library of the South-Manchurian Railway. By KATASHI KAKINUMA. Dairen: 1934. 275 pages.

Those of us who know little of what is going on in Manchukuo beyond what we read in magazines and newspapers may be surprised at the scholarly activity of the Japanese. Volumes have already been published on their excavations in South Manchuria. This catalogue gives a list of 7200 works in Chinese and Japanese, arranged according to the Dewey decimal system, which are concerned with Manchuria and Mongolia. They have been collected by the South-Manchurian Railway and imposingly housed in Dairen. There are indices of words, titles, and authors. The works cover a broad field of literature, and both the catalogue and the library itself should be of great value to scholars working in these subjects. The author has done a laborious and conscientious piece of work, and the South-Manchurian Railway is to be congratulated upon this side of its many activities.

Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies. Vol. I, No. 1. Edited by S. ELISSÉEFF, C. S. GARDNER and J. R. WARE. Cambridge, Mass.: HARVARD-YENCHING INSTITUTE, 1936. 161 pages.

The Harvard-Yenching Institute and the editors are to be congratulated upon the first number of this long-awaited American quarterly, which will be devoted to Eastern or Central Asian, or Indian subjects. Future issues will contain translations or abstracts of important articles which have appeared in Chinese, Japanese, or Russian, and annotated lists of articles and books on the Far East will appear annually. The present number contains a Foreword and fifteen articles, varying in length from twenty-one pages to less than a page. It might be better to group the shorter articles as brief notes. Three, possibly four, of the fifteen contributors are Americans and one of these is not a specialist on the Far East or India. Among the well-known foreign contributors are Anesaki, La Vallée Poussin, Przyluski, and von Stael-Holstein. The number is dedicated to the memory of James Haughton Woods, and the Foreword is an appreciation of his work by Professor Elisséeff and Dr. Ware. The rear cover contains a useful style sheet, which includes a list of abbreviations and the standards of romanization.

The articles are of the high scholarly standard that one would expect. It is not possible to give a detailed description, but a few criticisms may be made of one article, that by W. E. Hocking on "Chu Hsi's Theory of Knowledge."

Studies of the philosophy of the Far East must be made by men with an adequate training in philosophy, and Professor Hocking is a competent and well-known philosopher. But it is doubtful whether he would write on the theories of knowledge of Aristotle or Kant without a knowledge of Greek or German. Yet these subjects would be far safer for him than the one he has chosen, since good translations of Aristotle and Kant exist in English, whereas no adequate study has been made of Chu Hsi. Naturally Professor Hocking is obliged to depend on secondary authorities, and in his notes refers to Bruce, Zenker, McClatchie, Hackmann, and Beal. None of these are satisfactory authorities on which to base general statements about the thought of Chu Hsi. No attempt has been made to secure a Chinese collaborator who could have gone direct to the works of Chu Hsi. There is in the notes a good account of the development of a technical term, written by Lin Tsai-ping, but even this ignores the use of the term by the important thinkers of the third century of our era. It should be recognized that we are not yet ready for summary statements about a man like Chu Hsi, and few sinologists would have dared to attempt Professor Hocking's task, simply because we are not yet in a position to discuss the Sung philosophy. The article refers to Buddhist influence, and here again is a subject on which we know too little. The author does not seem to have consulted Suzuki, who might have given him some information on the Ch'an school, and particularly on the theory of sudden enlightenment, or intuition, as developed through the *Koan* exercise. Professor Hocking's article is interesting, but premature.

Some Technical Terms of Chinese Painting. By BENJAMIN MARCH. Baltimore: WAVERLY PRESS, 1935. 63 pages, 7 plates.

By the untimely death of Benjamin March, American Sinology lost one of its more brilliant scholars. Mr. March had already done valuable work, but his productive period apparently lay ahead of

him. He had specialized on Chinese art, particularly on painting, and had already achieved an international reputation in this subject. The present volume is his last, and most important contribution. It is published under the auspices of the American Council of Learned Societies, as No. 2 in the Morse Series of Studies in Chinese and Related Civilizations. The volume is dedicated to Berthold Laufer. There is an interesting preface by the author, and a list of terms defined.

The body of the volume consists of the definition and explanation of 302 technical terms, grouped under twelve headings. These include such subjects as materials, subjects, brushwork, trees, rocks and mountains, water, clouds, figures, seals, and mounting. While all the material presented already exists in Chinese sources, it has probably not been collected in this form anywhere else. In preparing the study, the author had the assistance of an adequately prepared Chinese artist, Mr. Lin Yü-ts'ang, who also drew the originals of most of the plates. The list is limited to terms used in technique, and does not include the terminology of criticism or aesthetics. Neither does it give the history of the development of the terms, which are defined simply in the modern Peiping usage. For instance, a monograph might be written on ink, its origin, history, manufacture, characteristics, and use. Mr. March devotes nine lines to the subject. The plates are good, and are of the sort to be seen in all Chinese works on the elements of painting.

By the limitations which he set for himself, Mr. March has been able to produce a concise, thorough, and valuable study. Had he lived, he would probably have pursued the subject further and written a larger and more important work. As it is, his study will be of help to all who wish to study Chinese painting seriously. It supplies the technical ground-work on which future criticisms and appreciations of Chinese painting will be based.

J. K. SHRYOCK.

Correction—The Lemon in India

In the article by Dr. Helen M. Johnson entitled "The Lemon in India," published in the JOURNAL 56. 47-50, by mistake it was not indicated that the paragraph in large type at the top of page 49 is a quotation from G. Watt, *The Commercial Products of India*. That paragraph and the paragraphs in small type preceding and following it are all three quoted from Watt's work.

EDITOR.

NOTES OF THE SOCIETY

Since the annual meeting of the SOCIETY in New Haven, April, 1936, the Executive Committee has elected to corporate membership the following four persons:

Dr. Samuel DeCoster Atkins

Miss Susan W. Orvis

Mr. William T. Avery

Mr. Laurence P. Roberts

The SOCIETY has lost by death the following members:

Field Marshal Viscount Allenby, G. C. B., G. C. M. G., honorary associate, died May 14, 1936.

Professor Richard J. H. Gottheil, died in New York, May 22, 1936.

Professor C. T. Benze, died in Mount Airy, Philadelphia, July 3, 1936.

Professor Antoine Meillet, honorary member, died in Paris, September 22, 1936.

NOTES OF OTHER SOCIETIES

THE AMERICAN COUNCIL OF LEARNED SOCIETIES is able to offer a limited number of small grants, ordinarily not exceeding \$300, to individual scholars to assist them in carrying on definite projects of research, already commenced, in the humanistic sciences: philosophy, philology, literature and linguistics, art and musicology, archaeology, and cultural and intellectual history. Applicants must possess the doctorate or its equivalent, must be citizens or permanent residents of the United States or Canada, and must be in personal need of the assistance for which they apply and unable to secure it from other sources. Grants are not awarded for the fulfillment of requirements for any academic degree.

Applications must be made in duplicate on special forms which will be supplied on request, and must be filed before January 15, 1937. For further information and for application forms, address the Secretary for Fellowships and Grants, American Council of Learned Societies, 907 Fifteenth Street, N. W., Washington, D. C.

THE COMMITTEES ON CHINESE AND JAPANESE STUDIES OF THE AMERICAN COUNCIL OF LEARNED SOCIETIES have been developing a Training Center for Far Eastern Studies in the Library of Congress. The activities of the Center commenced in September, 1934. The first considerable literary undertaking has been the preparation of a Biographical Dictionary of the Ch'ing Period. By March, 1936, more than four hundred sketches describing the careers of eminent Chinese of the 17th Century had been prepared by the members of the staff or contributed by other scholars. It is hoped that the completed work will contain fifteen hundred such entries. The Council has now issued a pamphlet containing twenty-two of these sketches, as an indication of what may be expected. The work has been carefully done, reflecting credit on the editor, Dr. Hummel, and on the scholars who have contributed to it.

THE GOVERNING BODY OF THE K. R. CAMA ORIENTAL INSTITUTE AND LIBRARY invites the following essay in English for the Sarosh K. R. Cama Prize of Rs. 250/- to be submitted by the 30th of June 1937:—"The prophecies of Zarathustra in the Gathas as expanded in the later Avesta and unravelled in the Pahlavi Zand-i Vohuman Yasn and the Pahlavi Dinkart, Book VII." The competition is open to all.

The writers are to submit their essays with nom-de-plume only written on the front page. Full name and address must be sent in a separate cover bearing the nom-de-plume on the outside. All communications should be addressed to the Joint Honorary Secretary, Sukhadvala Building, 172, Hornby Road, Fort, Bombay.

PROCEEDINGS
OF THE
American Oriental Society

AT THE MEETING AT NEW HAVEN, 1936

The sessions of the One Hundred and Forty Eighth Meeting of the Society were held at Yale University, on Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday, April 15th, 16th, and 17th, 1936. All the sessions took place in the Hall of Graduate Studies. The following members were present at one or more sessions:

Albright	Goodrich	Ogden, C. J.
Archer	Graves	O'Pray
Bar Am	Griswold	Peake
Bake	Hackney, Miss	Poleman
Barret	Hahn, Miss	Reich
Briggs	Hall, Miss	Reischauer, R. K.
Britton	Harris, Z. S.	Roach
Brown	Hatch, J. D.	Rostovtzeff
Bull	Hatch, W. H. P.	Rowe
Burrows	Hauptert	Rowell, Miss
Butin	Hodous	Sachs
Calverley	Huffman	Sakanishi, Miss
Campbell	Hummel	Sapir
Ch'iu	Hyatt	Schiller
Clark	Jackson	Shryock
Goomaraswamy	Jackson, Mrs.	Simsar
Dahl	Kennedy	Skoss
De Witt, Mrs.	Kent	Smith, Miss
Dubs	Keogh	Speiser
Eaton, Miss	Kraeling, C. H.	Staples
Edgerton, F.	Latourette	Stephens
Elisséef	Leidecker	Sturtevant
Evans	Lent	Swann, Miss
Faris	Lindquist, Miss	Torrey
Fiesel, Mrs.	Magoun	Vernadsky
Gardner	McGovern	Ware
Gaskill, Miss	Meek	Waterman
Gates, Miss	Montgomery, J. A.	Winnett
Glueck	Morgenstern	Wolfe
Goetze	Obermann	Wright, G. E.
Gordon		

Total 91

THE FIRST SESSION

At 10 o'clock Wednesday morning the first session of the meeting was called to order by President William F. Albright. Reading of the minutes of the meeting at Ann Arbor in 1935 was dispensed with as these were already in print (*JOURNAL* 55. 345). There were no corrections and the minutes were approved.

Professor Franklin Edgerton, Chairman of the Committee on Arrangements, presented his committee's report in the form of a printed programme. He announced that the Yale Faculty Club had offered the use of its facilities to the members of the Society; that members might visit the Society's library in the special space that it occupies in the Sterling Library; that at the Sterling Library the following exhibits had been arranged: Near Eastern manuscripts, printed books, and coins; objects selected from the Yale Babylonian Collection with opportunity to visit the collection itself; manuscripts and printed books from the Chinese and Japanese Collections; and Indic manuscripts. Professor Edgerton also announced that at the Gallery of Fine Arts the following were on exhibition: a part of the Egyptian Collection, objects of Babylonian and Assyrian art from the Babylonian Collection, the Mansfield Collection of Near Eastern Pottery, the Frederick Wells Williams Collection of Chinese Ceramics, and material from the Yale excavations at Dura in Syria and Jerāsh in Trans-Jordan.

Professor Edgerton proposed adoption of the following minute:

At this meeting in New Haven, the American Oriental Society deems it fitting to note that it is visiting once again the city where lived William Dwight Whitney, to whom it owes a greater debt than to any other single person in its history. He was the first great philological scholar, as that term is now understood, in this country, and may properly be considered the founder, directly or indirectly, of several of the leading American learned societies. On oriental and linguistic studies, in particular, he exerted an influence so profound that its ultimate effects defy any estimate. For years he carried the burden of the work of our society, at first almost unaided. At a time when workers in the field were few and when popular interest was virtually non-existent, he was content to take his own scholarly conscience as the sole guide to his activities: to do what his hand found to do, without a thought of appreciation by others, whether fellow-scholars or the general public. That such appreciation, of both kinds, came to him in exceptional measure, is a significant fact, which we may well ponder in moments of discouragement over lack of public recognition of our studies.

We record the hope that our society will continue to keep fresh the

memory of the greatest man in its history. Even more, we hope that it will strive to imitate him not only in scholarly method, but in disinterested devotion of spirit and loftiness of purpose.

It was voted to adopt this minute and to spread it upon the records of the Society; and to present a copy of it to our fellow-member, Miss Margaret Dwight Whitney, with assurance of our pride and gratification in possessing through her membership a direct link with her distinguished father, and of our deep regret that the state of her health made it impossible for her to be present at our meetings.

REPORT OF THE CORRESPONDING SECRETARY

The Corresponding Secretary, Professor LeRoy C. Barret, presented the following report:

The statistics concerning membership are a little more encouraging this year. At and since the last meeting one honorary member has been added to the roll, 62 have been elected to corporate membership (9 of whom did not accept), 20 have resigned and death has removed 16. The number of new members added during the past year (53) is a little larger than the number added during the previous year (48), and the number lost by death and resignation (36) is the same as the number lost for the same reasons during the previous year. The number of nominees for corporate membership today is a little larger than the number presented at the last annual meeting. The net gain during the year is 17.

The preceding summary seems to indicate a continuing and increasing interest in the Orient and in the scholarly pursuit of Oriental studies, and such studies seem still to attract eager and able students.

During the past year the Society was represented at the Nineteenth Congress of Orientalists at Rome by Professors Albright, Breasted, Gottheil, McCown, Reich, and Wilson, most of whom were also appointed by the Secretary of State as representatives of the Government of the United States. Professor Kent represented the Society at the celebration of the fiftieth anniversary of the founding of Bryn Mawr College on November 12, 1935. Professor W. Norman Brown has been appointed to represent the Society at the fortieth annual meeting of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences to be held in Philadelphia on April 24 and 25.

The Corresponding Secretary attended the Twelfth Annual Conference of Secretaries, held in Washington on January 30th in connection with the meeting of the American Council of Learned Societies devoted to Humanistic Studies. The discussions concerned matters of administration and of publication: such topics as the effect of regular changes in the secretaryship, the performance of editorial duties by a secretary, joint meetings of several societies, methods of increasing membership; and more particularly a recent proposal for a non-profit organization to publish scholarly works.

We now record briefly the names and services of those members whose deaths have been reported since the last meeting:

WILLIAM FREDERIC BADÉ, well known student of Palestinian archaeology and Old Testament literature, had attained recognition as a nature lover also. His excavation of the site of the biblical Mizpah was brought to completion last year. He had been a professor in the Pacific School of Religion since 1902; he edited the letters of John Muir, wrote his biography, and edited several of Muir's books. He was also active in movements for conservation of the natural resources of this country. He died March 4, 1936.

ALBERT FARWELL BEMIS was a graduate of Colorado College and of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. For over forty years he was engaged in business in Boston, and in part because of his business connections he became interested in the Orient. He was a member of the corporation of The Massachusetts Institute of Technology and of various clubs and learned societies. His death occurred on April 11, 1936.

JAMES HENRY BREASTED, preeminent as archaeologist and historian, unusually effective in stimulating research and in organizing it, was likewise endowed with great ability in making known to the general public the results of scientific work. His work is too well known and his ability too familiar to need even a reminder. He died December 2, 1935.

LEONE CAETANI, Duca di Sermoneta, after taking a degree in Oriental languages and history at the University of Rome, travelled much in India, Africa, and the Near East gathering material for his *Annali dell' Islam*. A number of years ago he settled down in British Columbia, and became a citizen of Canada. There he died on Christmas day 1935.

HERMANN COLLITZ, a native of Germany and a graduate of the University of Göttingen, came to the United States after several years of teaching and library work at the University of Halle. Here he taught at Bryn Mawr and at Johns Hopkins. He was a scholar of wide interests, of unusual ability, and of great accomplishments. He always elevated and broadened the scholarly inclinations of those who were associated with him, and his modest demeanor was very charming. He died in Baltimore on May 13, 1935, at the age of 80.

JOHN HOPKINS DENISON, after graduation from Williams College, studied at Andover Theological Seminary and held pastorates in New York and Boston. Having retired he had of late been a resident of New York City, spending seasons in Santa Barbara, California, and in Williamstown, Massachusetts. He was the author of several volumes, among which should be particularly mentioned his biography of Mark Hopkins, his grandfather. He died at sea on the way from California to Guatemala on October 14, 1935.

LEON DOMINIAN, born in Constantinople and a graduate of Robert College, had engaged in teaching, in geological surveys and explorations, and had in 1915 entered the Department of State of the United States. He was first

secretary at the legation at Montevideo at the time of his death July 25, 1935.

FRANK HUGH FOSTER, emeritus professor of Church History at Oberlin College, had taught at several colleges, was a contributor to reviews and religious papers, was for a time editor of *Bibliotheca Sacra*, and had published several books. He died in Oberlin October 20, 1935, at the age of 84.

IGNAZIO GUIDI, senior among our honorary members (he was elected in 1893) was a distinguished student of Semitic languages and cultures, of whom it has been said that he made himself an Orientalist. He spent many years teaching at the University of Rome. His publications during this long career were many and they dealt with a large variety of subjects. He died April 18, 1935, at the age of 91.

MAXIMILIAN LINDSAY KELLNER, for thirty years a teacher of Old Testament language and literature, had studied at Hobart, Harvard, and the Episcopal Theological School at Cambridge, at which latter institution he became a teacher. His publications dealt with Hebrew and Assyrian topics. He died in Cambridge, Massachusetts, on August 5, 1935.

SYLVAIN LÉVI, professor of Sanskrit at the Collège de France, was master of a number of Oriental languages, and was well known for his book *Le Théâtre Indien* and for his studies in Indian religions. He also made numerous contributions to journals and to *La Grande Encyclopédie*. He was an honorary member of our Society, and of the Royal Asiatic Society, and a member of a number of other learned societies. His death occurred on October 31, 1935.

DAVID GORDON LYON, professor emeritus at Harvard, was for forty years an active member of the faculty, noted for his studies and teaching in Semitic languages and in the history of religions. He was in former days regular in attendance at the meetings of our Society and his presence was enlivening. He died December 4, 1935, aged 83.

WILLIAM FREDERICK NOTZ, dean of the Foreign Service School at Georgetown University, was for a number of years economist and adviser with commissions of the national government. He had received decorations from several foreign governments in recognition of his work in developing international relations. His writings were varied in content, some falling strictly within the field of our Society. He died on June 4, 1935.

NAINSINH THAKAR, of Brooklyn, died in the summer of 1935. No further information about him has been received.

PETER WIERNIK, editor of the *Jewish Morning Journal* from its first issue, came to this country as a young immigrant and after a short period at unskilled labor he began his association with newspapers. He had a wide knowledge of history and was well grounded in other fields. He was an effective writer and an effective administrator. He died February 12, 1936.

ALFRED COOPER WOOLNER, a graduate of Trinity College, Oxford, had been

Principal of the Oriental College at Lahore, India, since 1903, and had also been Dean of University Instruction at the University of the Panjab, Vice Chancellor of the University, and Chairman of the University Board. His publications were largely concerned with Prakrits. A fine and scholarly Indologist, he passed away in his prime. He died in January, 1936.

Upon motion the report of the Corresponding Secretary was accepted.

Tribute was paid to Professor Foster by Professor Montgomery, to Professor Breasted by Dr. Bull and President Albright, and to Principal Woolner by Professor Brown.

The President announced the meeting of the Anglo-American Conference of Historians in London in July and that of the International Congress of Linguists at Copenhagen in August.

REPORT OF THE TREASURER

The Treasurer, Professor John C. Archer, presented his report as follows:

RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES FOR THE YEAR ENDING DECEMBER 31, 1935.

Receipts

Cash Balance, Jan. 1, 1935.....	\$16,636.18
Dues (from 465 members).....	2,555.51
Sales: JOURNAL.....	114.20
Amer. Orient. Series.....	50.16
Library Anc. Sem. Inscr.....	14.78
Library catalogues.....	2.40
W. F. Albright, on acct.....	110.00
JOURNAL reprints.....	80.15
Author's corrections.....	50.00
type charge.....	12.90
Constitution and By-laws.....	57.15
Library: refund of postage.....	1.00

Interest:

Mortgage	\$360.00
Yale University.....	481.19
Virginia Ry.....	50.00
Pacific Gas & Electr. Co.....	40.00
Morris and Essex R. R. Co.....	35.00
So. N. E. Tel. Co.....	50.00
	<hr/>
	1,016.19
J. E. Abbott legacy.....	267.06
	<hr/>

Total receipts..... 4,331.50

GRAND TOTAL..... \$20,967.68

Expenditures

The JOURNAL:

Printing	\$2,131.88
Paper, type, etc.....	141.30
Reprints	82.22
" add'l.....	59.55
Corrections	73.75
Reprints and corrections in Supp't.....	17.80
Expenses: Secretary.....	119.39
Treasurer	126.56
Editors	52.80
Librarian	78.85
Research	42.08
Dues, A. C. L. S.....	25.00
Am. Sch. Orient. Research.....	10.00

Honoraria:

W. N. Brown.....	200.00
E. A. Speiser.....	200.00
J. K. Shryock.....	200.00
J. C. Archer.....	100.00
New Constitution.....	87.25

Monograph Account:

Oxford Univ. Press.....	22.21
Vol. 6 Amer. Orient. Series.....	787.05
Advertising	27.25
Refund (Prof. Pfeiffer).....	92.85

Investments:

Morris & Essex R. R. (2) 3½s n-c	
Pacif. Gas & E. (2) 1st 4's 1964	
St. Louis Term. Ry. (2) 4's 1935	
So. N. E. Tel. Co. (2) 5's 1970	
Conn. Coke (2) 1st 5's 1948 ser. A.....	10,509.82
GRAND TOTAL.....	\$15,187.61
Balance Jan. 1, 1936.....	5,780.07
	<hr/> \$20,967.68

JOURNAL ACCOUNT

<i>Receipts</i>		<i>Expenditures</i>	
Appropriation for 1935..	\$2,650.00	Printing	2,131.88
Sales	696.16	extra type, etc.	141.30
Constitution & By-laws...	57.15	Returns	41.56
Type chg. paid by author.	12.90	Commission on sales less	
Reprints	80.15	returns	163.65
Corrections	50.00	Transportation	174.20
Balance Jan. 1, 1935.....	86.57	Stock (5,000 env.)	65.75
		Mailing 3420 cop. @ 4c...	136.80
	<u>\$3,632.93</u>	Reprints	82.22
		"	6.90
		Corrections	73.75
		"	10.90
		Additional reprints.....	59.55
		Const'n & By-laws.....	87.25
		Editors' expenses.....	52.80
		Balance Jan. 1, 1936.....	404.42
			<u>\$3,632.93</u>

MONOGRAPH ACCOUNT

(incl. Amer. Orient. Series, Library Anc. Sem. Inscr.)

Balance Jan. 1, 1935.....	\$5,009.85	Oxf. Press to close acct..	22.21
Albright, on acct.....	110.00	Vol. 6 A. O. Ser.....	787.05
Sales, 9 Lib. ASI.....	14.78	refund to author.....	92.85
(4 @ 2.27 ½		advertising	27.25
5 1.13 ½ for'n)		Balance forward, Jan. 1,	
Panch'tra Yale Pr.	32.85	1936	4,255.43
Oxf Pr..	17.31		
			<u>\$5,184.79</u>
	<u>\$5,184.79</u>		

BALANCE SHEET

<i>Assets</i>		<i>Liabilities</i>	
1st Mortgage, N. H. prop.	\$6,000.00	Capital funds:	
Bonds: Virginia Ry.....	1,000.00	Abbott	\$6,454.56
Morris & Essex...	2,000.00	Bradley	3,000.00
Pacif. G. & E. Co.	2,000.00	Casanowicz	150.00
St. Louis Ter. Ry.	2,000.00	Cotheal	1,500.00
So. N. E. Tel. Co..	2,000.00	Whitney	1,000.00
Cons. Coke Co....	2,000.00	Life Membership.....	4,175.00
Stock C. R. I. & P. Ry....	75.00	Reserve	2,000.00
Cash Jan. 1, 1936*.....	5,780.07	Bal. JOURNAL acc't.....	414.42
		Bal. Monograph acc't....	4,255.43
	<u>\$22,855.07</u>	Bal. Current funds	
		(Debit)	84.34

* \$84.34 Debit.

\$22,855.07

REPORT OF THE AUDITING COMMITTEE

It is hereby certified that the accounts of the Treasurer have been examined and have been found correct, and that the accompanying Report is in conformity with the accounts.

MILLAR BURROWS,
CHARLES C. TORREY,
Auditing Committee.

Upon motion the reports of the Treasurer and the Auditing Committee were accepted.

REPORT OF THE LIBRARIAN

The Librarian, Professor Andrew Keogh, presented his report as follows:

During the years 1935/36 seventy-eight volumes and three hundred and eighty-one numbers of periodicals have been added to the Society's Library. Of the periodicals three hundred and seventy were in continuation of sets already in the Library; ten represent sets new to the Library. Three new titles have been added to the list of exchanges: Toyo Bunko Ronsô, Indian Government epigraphical publications, and Monumenta serica. Eighty-one volumes, representing for the most part journals in frequent use, have been bound at a cost of \$77.05; the \$22.95 remaining from the \$100 appropriation for the Library has been used to complete our files of periodicals and occasionally for the purchase of monographs. As the Library has no endowment and the appropriations for it are necessarily small, very few modern books are added by purchase. The strength of the Library is in its sets of periodicals. Ninety-seven volumes were received in the Library and forwarded to the editors of the Journal for review.

In addition to this routine work a beginning has been made in the sorting, filing, and listing of papers, letters, etc. in the archives of the Society. Also during this year rubbings and photostats of two inscriptions: the Bheraghat stone inscription of the Queen Alhanadevi and the Tewar stone inscription of the reign of Jayasimhaddeva, were supplied to the government epigraphist of India for use in the forthcoming fourth volume of the Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum. These impressions were made from the original stones presented to the Society by Dr. F. E. Hall about 1860 and now in the Library.

The cataloguing of books, pamphlets, and periodicals is up to date.

The following is a list of the accessions for the year:¹

'Abd al-Ghanî ibn Ismâ'îl al-Nâbulusî. al-Ḥaram aš-šarîf. al-Ḥadra al-unsijja fi'rriḥla al-qudsijja; Auszug. 1918.
Abdul Ghaffar. Short biography of my Huzur. 3d ed. [1934]

¹ The Editors call attention to the fact that reference in this list constitutes acknowledgment of many publications sent to the JOURNAL for review.

- Akademîia nauk, Leningrad. Dal'nevostochnyi filial Vladivostok. Vestnik. 1 (8). 1934.
- All-India oriental conference, 8th, Mysore. [Handbook, summaries of papers, etc.] 8v.
- American oriental society. Supplement to the Journal. v. 1. 1935.
- American schools of oriental research. Catalogue 1935/36. 1936.
- Barton, G. A. Royal inscriptions of Sumer and Akkad. 1929. (Library of ancient Semitic inscriptions, v. 1)
- Bhandarkar oriental research institute, Poona, India (Bombay). Descriptive catalogue of the government collections of manuscripts. Comp. by Hiralal Rasikdas Kapadia. v. 17. Jaina literature and philosophy. pt. 1 (a) Āgamika literature. 1935.
- Bombay University Library. Descriptive catalogue of the Arabic, Persian, Urdu manuscripts in the library of the University of Bombay. By 'Abdu'l-Ḳādir-e-Sarfarāz. 1935.
- Brandstetter, R. Wir Menschen der indonesischen Erde. X. Grundsteine zur all-indonesischen Literaturwissenschaft. 2. Grundstein: Die Bedeutung der all-indonesischen Literaturwissenschaft für Sprachforschung und Völkerpsychologie. 1936.
- Breasted, J. H. The beginnings of time-measurement and the origins of our calendar. [1935]
- Candioti, A. M. Jadikat ul jubb. El jardín del amor, vida de un joven emir damasceno del siglo VI de la hégira. 1933.
- College art association. Loan exhibition of early Indian sculptures, paintings and bronzes. Catalogued by N. M. Heeramaneck. [1935?]
- Coomaraswamy, A. K. The darker side of dawn. 1935. (Smithsonian miscellaneous collections, v. 94, no. 1)
- Costello, L. S. The rose garden of Persia. 1844.
- Credner, W. Cultural and geographical observations made in the Tali (Yunnan) region with special regard to the Nan-Chao problem. Tr. from German into English by E. Seidenfaden. 1935.
- Drapkin, I. Contribution to the demographic study of Easter Island. 1935. (Bernice P. Bishop museum. Occasional papers, v. 11, n. 12)
- Edgar, J. H. English-Giarung vocabulary. [1935?] (Supplement to vol. V, Journal of the West China border research society)
- Emory, K. P. Archaeology of the Pacific equatorial islands. 1934. (Bernice P. Bishop museum. Bulletin 123)
- Tuamotuan stone structures. 1934. (Bernice P. Bishop museum. Bulletin 118)
- Field, H. Arabs of Central Iraq; their history, ethnology, and physical characters. With introduction by Sir A. Keith. 1935. (Field mus. of nat. hist. Anthropology. Memoirs, v. IV)
- Fitzgerald, C. P. Son of Heaven. A biography of Li Shih-Min, founder of the T'ang dynasty. 1933.
- Fortune, R. F. Manus religion. 1935. (Memoirs of the American philosophical society, v. 3)
- Goetz, H. Een van de bronnen, waaruit Mr. Nicolaas Witsen geput heeft voor zijn werk "Noord- en Oost-Tartarijen" teruggevonden. [1935]

- Hambly, W. D. Culture areas of Nigeria. F. H. Rawson-Field museum ethnological expedition to West Africa, 1929-30. 1935. (Field mus. of nat. hist. Pub. 346. Anthropol. ser. v. 21, no. 3)
- Handy, E. S. C. Outline of Hawaiian physical therapeutics, by E. S. C. Handy, M. K. Pukui, K. Livermore. 1934. (Bernice P. Bishop museum. Bulletin 126)
- Hemmi, B. Study of the forms of images for worship in India. 1935. (Toyo bunko ronsô. Ser. A., v. 21)
- Henderson, J. R. The coins of Haidar Ali and Tipu Sultan. 1921.
- Hevesy, W. von. Du danger de l'emploi des termes "langues austro-asiatiques" et "langues austriques." 1935-XIII.
- Neue finnisch-ugrische Sprachen. 1935-XIII.
- Réponse à une critique de M. Aurélien Sauvageot. 1935.
- Sur la non-existence de la famille des langues austriques et sur le finno-ougrien dans l'Inde. [1934]
- Höfner, Maria. Zur Interpretation altsüdarabischer Inschriften II. [1935]
- Hyde, W. W. Roman Alpine routes. 1935. (Memoirs of the American philosophical society, v. 2)
- India. Census commissioner. Census of India, 1931. v. 1. India. pt. 3. Ethnographical. 1935.
- Indian culture. Journal of the Indian research institute. v. 2⁽¹⁾. 1935.
- Jayatilaka, D. B. Dictionary of the Sinhalese language, comp. under the direction of W. Geiger. By D. B. Jayatilaka, A. M. Gunasekara, W. F. Gunawardhana, J. de Lanerolle. v. 1. pt. 1. 1935.
- Jenness, D. The Ojibwa Indians of Parry Island, their social and religious life. 1935. (Canada. National museum. Bulletin no. 78. Anthropological series, no. 17)
- Jewish studies in memory of George A. Kohut 1874-1933. Ed. by S. W. Baron and Alexander Marx. 1935.
- Jhabvala, S. H. Zoroastrianism. 1934.
- K. B. S. Quarterly. Bulletin of the Kokusai Bunka Shinkokai (The Society for international cultural relations) v. 1, no. 1. 1935.
- Karnatak historical research society. Annual report for 1932/33 and Proceedings of the annual meeting of the general body held on 18-6-1933. 1933.
- Lefever, H. The Vedic idea of sin. 1935.
- Lindblom, G. Kamba folklore. v. 2-3. 1934-35. (Archives d'études orientales. v. 20: 2-3)
- Lyydilläisiä kielenkäytöitä koonneet Heikki Ojansu, Juho Kujola, Jalo Kalima ja Lauri Kettunen. 1934. (Suomalais-ugrilaisen seuran Toimituksia, LXIX)
- Macgregor, G. Notes on the ethnology of Pukapuka. 1935. (Bernice P. Bishop museum. Occasional papers, v. 11, no. 6)
- Madras. Government museum. Bulletin, v. II, no. 2, v. III, no. 3, v. V, no. 1. Anthropology. 1898-1915. 3v.
- Catalogue of the exhibits in the economic products section except wood specimens, by S. N. Chandrasekhara Ayyar. 1921.

- — Catalogue of the prehistoric antiquities, by R. Bruce Foote. 1901.
- — Catalogue of the prehistoric antiquities from Adichanallūr and Perumbāir, by Alexander Rea. 1915.
- — The Foote collection of Indian prehistoric and protohistoric antiquities. Catalogue raisonné by R. B. Foote. 1914.
- — The Foote collection of Indian prehistoric and protohistoric antiquities. Notes on their ages and distribution. 1916.
- — Gramophone records of the languages and dialects of the Madras presidency. Text of passages. 1927.
- Mohammed Wahid Mirza. The life and works of Amir Khusrau. 1935. (Panjab university oriental publications)
- Montgomery, J. A. The Ras Shamra mythological texts, by J. A. Montgomery and Z. S. Harris. 1935. (Memoirs of the American philosophical society. v. 4)
- Nyberg, H. S. Studien zum Hoseabuche. [1935] (Uppsala universitets årsskrift 1935: 6)
- — Texte zum Mazdayasnischen Kalender. [1934] (Uppsala universitets årsskrift 1934. Program 2)
- Oriental affairs, a monthly review, v. 3, no. 18. 1935.
- Pañcaviṃśa-Brāhmaṇa, the Brāhmaṇa of twenty-five chapters. Tr. by Dr. W. Caland. 1931. (Bibliotheca Indica. Work no. 255, issue no. 1514, new series)
- Paris. Musée Guimet. Catalogue des collections indochinoises par P. Dupont avec la collaboration d'attachées au Musée, précédé d'études par P. Stern, J. Auboyer, G. de Coral Rémusat, P. Dupont. 1934.
- Propato, F. A. La organización de los altos estudios de orientalismo en la Universidad argentina. 1934.
- Rana, Framjee A. Parsi law embodying the law of marriage and divorce and inheritance and succession applicable to Parsis in British India. 1934.
- Ravila, P. ed. Reste lappischen Volksglaubens gesammelt und herausgegeben. 1934. (Suomalais-ugrilaisen seuran Toimituksia, LXVIII)
- Rose, E. Beiträge zur Kenntnis des śivaitischen Namenglaubens nach den Purāṇen. Eine religionsgeschichtliche und textkritische Untersuchung. 1934.
- Sanskrit mss., containing: Kaṭhakagrhyasūtra, Divapāla's Bhāṣya to the above, Nṛṇāyamṛtam Dharmacastra nibhanda.
- Sapir, E. Hittite *hapatis* 'vassal' and Greek *hērādes*. [1934]
- Sind historical society. Journal. v. 1, pt. 2. 1934.
- Stimson, J. F., comp. and tr. Legends of Maui and Tahaki. 1934. (Bernice P. Bishop museum. Bulletin 127)
- Taraporewala, I. J. S. Elements of the science of language. 1932.
- Toledo museum of art. Modern Japanese prints, wood-block prints by ten artists. 1936.
- — Museum news, no. 71. 1935.
- Tomsk. Universitet. Tomskii gosudarstvennyi universitet, 50 let so dñia osnovaniia. 1934.

- Tsereteli, G. F., *ed.* Papyri russischer und georgischer Sammlungen. v. V. 1935.
- Vernadskii, G. V. A propos des origines du servage de "kabala" dans le droit russe. [1935]
- Vināya-Kumara Sarkara. The Ain-i-Akbari as a semi-Moslem and semi-Hindu Arthashastra. [1935]
- Hindu sociological literature from Chandeshvara to Rammohun (c. 1300-1833). [1935]
- [—] Kautalya, economic planning and climatology. [1935]
- Nilakantha and Mitra-Misra. 1935.
- The political philosophy of Ramdas the guru of Shivaji the Great. [1935]
- Winlock, H. E. Ed Dakhleh oasis by H. E. Winlock, with an appendix by Ludlow Bull. 1936. (Metropolitan museum of art. Dept. of Egyptian art. v. 5)

On motion the report of the Librarian was accepted.

REPORT OF THE EDITORS OF THE JOURNAL

Professor Brown presented the report of the Editors of the JOURNAL as follows:

Since the 1935 meeting of the Society the Editors have published parts 2, 3, and 4 of Volume 55, and part 1 of Volume 56, a total of 484 pages. During the year it was possible to make a new publishing contract with our printers, and to secure a lower rate than we had been paying. In this connection we would like to express our appreciation of the excellent work which the J. H. Furst Company does for the Society in handling our very difficult material.

We have also published Volume 7 of the American Oriental Series, M. B. Emeneau, *A Union List of Printed Indic Texts and Translations in American Libraries*, xvi + 540 pages. This work was done under the auspices of the American Council of Learned Societies' Committee on Indic and Iranian Studies, and the cost of publishing the book was met by the Council. The book is a valuable bibliographical tool and its sale has been good. Volumes 8 and 9 of the American Oriental Series are now in press: Volume 8, Zellig S. Harris, *A Grammar of the Phoenician Language*; Volume 9, LeRoy C. Barrett, *The Kashmirian Atharva Veda, Books 16 and 17*.

W. NORMAN BROWN,
J. K. SHRYOCK,
E. A. SPEISER,
Editors.

On motion the report of the Editors was accepted.

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

The Corresponding Secretary reported for the Executive Committee as follows:

The first undertaking of the Executive Committee during the period since the last meeting was without result. Last June it seemed possible that the Federal Government might apply some relief funds to help scholarly activities. We soon found that there was no chance to help being given to any project the Society would be willing to recommend, and that there were very few in our sphere of activity who would be considered eligible to receive funds.

The names of 22 persons who were elected corporate members of the Society have been published in the JOURNAL 55.113, 236, 484; 56.111.

The following amendment to the constitution of the American Council of Learned Societies devoted to Humanistic Studies was ratified by vote of the Executive Committee in October 1935:

Voted, To amend the Constitution by adding to Article 3 the following paragraph:

(d) Any member of a constituent society not otherwise a member of the Corporation who may be elected to a constitutional office of the Council, but such *ex-officio* membership shall be only for the duration of the term of office.

and to instruct the Secretary to communicate this amendment to the constituent societies for ratification.

On motion the actions of the Executive Committee were ratified.

ELECTION OF HONORARY MEMBERS

On recommendation of the Directors the following persons were unanimously elected honorary members of the Society:

Gustaf Hermann Dalman, Professor of Old Testament Exegesis in the University of Griefswald, Germany.

Reynold A. Nicholson, formerly Lecturer in Persian in the University of Cambridge, England.

Louis de la Vallée-Poussin, Professor of Sanskrit emeritus in the University of Ghent, Belgium.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS

Forty-nine persons recommended by the Directors were duly elected corporate members of the Society (including two who were elected at a later session). The following have qualified by the payment of dues:

N. Abbott	J. P. Hyatt
L. Bachhofer	Miss I. Lewisohn
A. A. Bake	Miss E. W. Lindquist
M. Bar Am	R. A. Martin
T. C. Bernard	Miss L. Michel
A. A. Brux	J. L. Mihelic
R. T. Burton	Miss C. M. Olmstead
R. P. Casey	R. M. O'Pray
I. Dyen	Miss A. L. Perkins
Miss E. S. Eaton	R. M. Riefstahl
K. C. Evans	A. J. Sachs
H. Frankfort	F. Safar
Miss Eva Fiesel	L. L. Scaife
H. W. Glidden	M. D. Schwartz
W. C. Hayes	G. M. Sinclair
H. C. Hollis	S. Spiegel
P. E. Huffman	T. C. Young

THE NEW CONSTITUTION OF THE SOCIETY

President Julian Morgenstern, chairman of the Society's Committee on Policy, announced that his committee had presented to the Directors the proposed new Constitution and By-laws as printed in JOURNAL 55. 226, with two proposed amendments as follows:

In By-law I for the word *present* read *submit*.

Delete By-law IXc and change the designations IXd and IXe to IXc and IXd respectively.

He further announced that the Directors had amended the last sentence of the proposed By-law I so that it would read as follows:

He shall receive a stipend to be fixed by the Executive Committee, which stipend shall include the cost of his clerical assistance and other expenses.

Dr. Morgenstern then announced, on behalf of the Directors, that they had voted to recommend to the Society for adoption the proposed Constitution and By-laws as printed, subject to the three

amendments above set forth, and he moved their adoption as the constitution and By-laws of the Society.

Questions were raised by Professors Waterman and Archer which were replied to by President Morgenstern and Professors Barret, Edgerton, and Sturtevant.

It was voted to adopt the proposed new Constitution and By-laws as amended.

On motion of President Morgenstern it was voted to express the thanks of the Society to the American Council of Learned Societies Devoted to Humanistic Studies for valuable advice given and financial aid rendered to the Committee on Policy in its deliberations on the subject of the new Constitution and By-laws.

ELECTION OF OFFICERS

In the absence of Professor A. T. Olmstead, Chairman of the Committee on the Nomination of Officers for 1936-1937, Professor Walter E. Clark presented the committee's report as follows:

President: Professor EDGAR H. STURTEVANT, of Yale University.

Vice-President: Professor LEROY WATERMAN, of the University of Michigan.

Secretary-Treasurer: Professor CARL H. KRAELING, of Yale University.

Librarian: Professor ANDREW KEOGH, of Yale University.

Editor: Professor W. NORMAN BROWN, of the University of Pennsylvania.

Associate Editors: Dr. JOHN KNIGHT SHRYOCK, of Philadelphia; and Professor EPHRAIM A. SPEISER, of the University of Pennsylvania.

Executive Committee: Professor HAROLD H. BENDER, of Princeton University, for one year; Mr. MORTIMER GRAVES, of Washington, D. C., for two years; and Professor ALBERT H. LYBYER, of the University of Illinois, for three years.

Committee on Nominations: Professor WALTER E. CLARK, of Harvard University, chairman, Professor KENNETH S. LATOURETTE, of Yale University, and Professor W. A. IRWIN, of the University of Chicago, all for one year; Professor ROLAND G. KENT, of the University of Pennsylvania, Doctor A. W. HUMMEL, of the Library of Congress, and Professor SHELDON H. BLANK, of the Hebrew Union College, all for two years.

The officers thus nominated were duly elected.

On the nomination of Professor Clark, Professor Nathaniel Schmidt, of Cornell University, was elected the Society's representative on the Board of the American Schools of Oriental Research.

President Albright then delivered his Presidential Address:

"How well can we know the Ancient East?" (published *JOURNAL* 56. 121).

After the session the members of the Society were the guests of Yale University at a luncheon in Memorial Hall.

THE SECOND SESSION

The second session was called to order at 2.30 P. M.

It was voted that the Corresponding Secretary send a telegram to Professor Charles R. Lanman of Harvard University, expressing the greetings of the members of the Society and their regret at his absence.

The following papers were read:

Professor THEOPHILE J. MEEK, of the University of Toronto: Monotheism with the Sumerians and Babylonians. Remarks by Professors Kent, Albright, and Reich, Dr. Shryock, and Dr. Coomaraswamy

A critical examination of the thesis of Langdon that the Sumerians were originally monotheistic and of the thesis of other scholars that theoretical, if not practical monotheism early developed in Babylonia and may have been the source of Hebrew monotheism. It is shown that the Sumerians never even approximated monotheism, but with the Babylonians and Assyrians there was a very definite tendency in that direction, which, however, was never fully realized, as it was with the Hebrews.

Professor JAMES A. MONTGOMERY, of the University of Pennsylvania: 1) Etymology of Hebrew *dârôm*, 'south'; 2) Etymology of 'element,' 'hangar,' 'hanger.' Remarks by Professors Kent, Goetze, Burrows, Reich, Dr. Gordon, and Mr. Simsar.

Professor C. C. TORREY, of Yale University: *Ex oriente lux?* on certain English words. Remarks by Professors Montgomery and Kent, and Dr. Bull.

Professor W. H. P. HATCH, of the Episcopal Theological School, Cambridge, Mass.; The Subscription in the Chester Beatty Manuscript of the Harelean Gospels. Remarks by Professor Albright.

Some Syriac manuscripts contain a subscription which tells about the making of the Philoxenian and Harelean versions of the Gospels. This subscription is found in a Chester Beatty codex dated 1177 A. D., which has not hitherto been brought to the attention of scholars. The paper contains a transcription of the subscription from this manuscript and an English translation. Variant readings preserved in other manuscripts are noted, and previous publications of the subscription are mentioned. The author of the subscription speaks of two places, *Heracleia* and the *Enaton*, concerning whose location

various views have been held. The writer of the paper discusses these questions and offers some new suggestions.

Professor J. C. ARCHER, of Yale University: The pluralistic One in Hindu Idealism. Remarks by Dr. Coomaraswamy.

Professor E. A. SPEISER, of the University of Pennsylvania: Caucasian Influences in the Nuzi Verb. Remarks by Professors Goetze and Albright, Dr. Gordon, and Dr. Ogden.

Many expressions in the Nuzi documents are at variance with idiomatic Akkadian usage. A number of these may be attributed to the scribes' imperfect knowledge of the language. But in a series of other instances the influence of a linguistic substratum is clearly discernible. This is especially true of the passival conception of the verb, such as has been demonstrated in Urartean, whose relationship with Hurrian is becoming steadily more apparent. While our knowledge of Hurrian is as yet inchoate, the evidence from Nuzi favors strongly the presence of a passival conception of the verb, an established Caucasian characteristic, in Hurrian proper.

Dr. LUDLOW BULL, of the Metropolitan Museum: Four inscribed Egyptian Statuettes of the Middle Kingdom (illustrated). Remarks by Professor Reich. Published JOURNAL 56. 166.

On Wednesday evening the members of the Society were entertained by the New Haven Oriental Club at an informal gathering at the Yale Faculty Club.

THE THIRD SESSION

The third session was called to order at 9.15 on Thursday morning, in three sections.

THE SECTION FOR SEMITICS AND RELATED STUDIES

Vice-president Waterman presided in the section for Semitics and Related Studies. The following papers were read:

President JULIAN MORGENSTERN, Hebrew Union College: The Festival of Jeroboam I (I Ki. 12: 32-13: 32), the Sin of Uzziah (II Ki. 15. 5; II Chron. 26: 16-21) and the Prophet Amos. Remarks by Professors Albright, Meek, Montgomery, and Glueck.

This paper will attempt to show the true import of the peculiar narrative in I Ki. 12: 32-13: 32 and to unravel the confused chronological data recorded there by correlating this narrative with the parallel tradition of Uzziah's sin, set forth in II Chron. 26: 16-21 and elsewhere in Biblical writings and in Josephus, Ant. IX, 10, 4 and likewise with the precise date of Amos and the import of his fifth vision.

Professor N. J. REICH, of Dropsie College: a) The Chester Beatty Papyrus, No. 16. b) The Wilfred Merton Ostraca, Nos. 1 and 2. Remarks by Professor Albright.

Mr. A. SACHS, of Johns Hopkins University: Two Cuneiform Place-names. Remarks by Professors Goetze, Albright, Speiser, and Waterman.

A new occurrence of *Surmarrāti*, the ancient name of *Samarra*, is found in no. 530 of Harper's *Assyrian and Babylonian Letters*. It has been misread under various disguises owing to the fact that the two elements of the first sign were read separately.

The country *Tu-na-na-at*, which occurs in Amarna letter 53, is mentioned together with the country *Zinzar*; a country *Du-na-na-pa*, followed by *Zinzira*, is mentioned in a Hittite geographical list. Since Mr. Sidney Smith informs me that the last sign of *Tu-na-na-at* is *at* (not *ap*), an assimilation (or dissimilation), a scribal error, or even contamination by *Tunip* must be considered.

Dr. W. E. STAPLES, of Victoria University: A Massoretic Law. Remarks by Professors Speiser and Albright.

Beghadhkephath letters beginning a syllable after a closed syllable are pronounced as mutes, and those following a vowel sound as spirants. The paper is designed to summarize the available evidence as to the origin and development of this law and to suggest a possible solution as coming from the Greek through the Syriac.

Professor J. J. OBERMANN, of Yale University: Magic Bowls in the Yale Babylonian Collection. Remarks by Dr. Gordon and Professor Albright.

(a) Bowl No. YBC 2359. Aramaic inscription in Square Hebrew characters. The text. Analysis of the incantation formula.

(b) Bowl No. YBC 2364. Large Mandaic inscription. Literary style of the introductory section. Preliminary analysis of the text. Difficulties of decipherment.

Professor MILLAR BURROWS, of Yale University: "I have written on the door" (Lacish Letter iv. 3). Remarks by Professors Albright, Montgomery and Obermann.

Professor C. C. TORREY, of Yale University: A Palmyrene Alphabetic Charm (illustrated). Remarks by President Morgenstern, Professor Montgomery and Dr. Gordon.

Professor E. A. SPEISER, of the University of Pennsylvania: The Values of three Hurrian Numerals. Remarks by Professor Meek.

The Nuzi documents occasionally describe animals with the aid of the Hurrian terms *šin(t)arpu*, *kikarpu*, and *tumnarpu*. In parallel contexts we find instead the Sumerian or Akkadian designations for "two-year-old," "three-year-old," and "four-year-old." It follows that *-arpu* denotes "year" or "age," with the initial elements indicating numbers. Now *šin* has long been known to designate "two" in Hurrian; cf. also *šināḫilu* "of second(ary) rank" and *šinamu*

"substitute." *Tum*-, known from the Mitanni letter, can be shown to mean "four," and *kik*- is in all probability "three."

Professor THEOPHILE J. MEEK, of the University of Toronto: A New God in Old Akkadian. Remarks by Professors Albright, Speiser and Goetze.

THE SECTION FOR INDO-IRANIAN AND RELATED STUDIES

Vice-president Ogden presided in the section for Indo-Iranian and Related Studies. The following papers were read:

Dr. H. W. MAGOUN, of Belmont, Mass.: The Caesura, an ancient Phenomenon.

Native testimony shows that a caesura was a verse section, not a pause, preceding a break in the sense. A second included the first.

There are parallels in the Classical hexameter and the Sanskrit epic, in verse divisions, number of syllables, etc.; but the latter also resembles the Asclepiadean major and the iambic tetrameter.

Rhythm, not syllable counting, was the basis of Sanskrit poetry, precisely as it was of Classical poetry.

The caesura appears to be the result of an original tendency to divide poetic lines into equal parts, although they were occasionally unequal. Ultimately, they were regularly unequal.

Professor E. H. STURTEVANT, of Yale University: Some Hittite Etymologies. Remarks by Professors Sapir, Goetze, and Kent. Published JOURNAL 56. 282.

Dr. A. K. COOMARASWAMY, of the Boston Museum of Fine Arts: Nirukta = Hermeneia. Remarks by Professor Edgerton and Dr. Ogden.

Nirukta or hermeneia is exegesis based on the theory of a natural connection between sounds and meanings. The explanations afforded should not be spoken of as "false etymologies;" they are based on the supposed affinities of words, which may or may not coincide with their actual pedigrees; hence they are neither endorsed nor condemned by the strict grammarians. Nirukta is based on the theory of language and eternity of sound assumed in the Pūrva Mīmāṃsā; that it has been little studied by modern scholars, is stated by Professor Macdonell to be a consequence of its lack of philosophical interest. Plato, however, in the Cratylus, where Socrates and Cratylus are agreed that the letter ρ "imitates rapidity, motion, and hardness," devotes a great deal of time to the theory of "true names;" and has generally been considered to have been a philosopher. In any case, the method has a minimum value, as showing what content was attributed by contemporary authors to words of pregnant meaning employed in scripture, for example in the āpaṇṣads.

Professor R. G. KENT, of University of Pennsylvania: The present Status

of Old Persian Studies. Remarks by Dr. Ogden. Published JOURNAL 56. 208.

Dr. EVA FIESEL, of Yale University: Some new Evidence on the History of the Alphabet.

It has been held by all scholars that the sign \div , \times (West Greek *se*, East Greek *Chi*) was not employed in Etruscan. But it surely occurs in archaic documents from Southern Etruria in the value of a *sibilant*. This makes an additional difficulty with the theory that the Latin alphabet was derived from Etruscan. Furthermore it suggests that the *Lycian* sign \div originally also represented a *sibilant*. This would link up the Etruscan alphabet with the *Lycian* and favour the assumption that the Etruscans brought their alphabet with them when they immigrated into Italy.

Professor F. EDGERTON, of Yale University: (a) Indic *disati*, 'speaks.' (b) Indirect Suggestion in Poetry: a Hindu Theory of Literary Aesthetics. Remarks by Dr. Coomaraswamy and Dr. Ogden.

The IE. root *deik-*, *dik-* means "show, point (out)." Only in Latin does it develop the meaning "say" (*dico*), at least in a clear and definite way. Or so it has always been believed. In our Sanskrit and Pali lexicons, there is no record of *dis-ati* and its congeners in the meaning "speak, say." But in the hybrid Sanskrit of the Buddhists, *disati* is used in the meaning "says." This usage must have existed in the (lost) protocanonical Prakrit of the Buddhists. It has also been discovered in Apabhraṃśa, which I have shown was closely related to that dialect. Sheth's *Prakrit Dictionary* gives for Pkt. *disati* the Hindi equivalent *kahnā*, "to say."

THE SECTION FOR FAR EASTERN STUDIES

Professor Latourette presided in the section for Far Eastern Studies. The following papers were read:

Professor ROSWELL S. BRITTON, of New York University: Studies in Chinese Palaeography.

An outline of recent contributions, especially the results of work of Chinese scholars in deciphering and interpreting the Shang script as found on the Yin Hsi divination relics; also recent efforts and present undertakings of Western scholars, and a resumé of the facilities existing in the United States and Canada, with some remarks upon the problems of approach and presentation from the Western viewpoint.

Dr. ROBERT K. REISCHAUER, of Princeton, N. J.: The Japanese *Shōen*, or Manor. Remarks by Professor Elisséeff.

This paper is itself an abstract. It touches briefly on the meaning of the term *shōen*, and the different origins, forms, and the adminis-

trations of *shōen*. It gives short descriptions of the various forms of land tenure, types of land rights, kinds of farmers and officials found in the *shōen* system, and suggests satisfactory English equivalents for the most important Japanese technical terms used in writing about the *shōen*. In short, the paper attempts to furnish a concise, yet fairly adequate, and clear description of the salient features of the Japanese *shōen* system.

Mr. CHARLES G. GARDNER, of Harvard-Yenching Institute: Pythagorean Doctrines in China. Remarks by Professor Dubs.

Chavannes in 1898 observed correct statement of the Pythagorean untempered chromatic scale in a Chinese work of the third century B. C., and the probability of its transmission from Greeks who followed Alexander into Bactria. Historians of Chinese mathematics have long remarked the Pythagorean theorem in a work traditionally dated a thousand years B. C. Recent studies show that it belongs to the last centuries B. C. The two books are intimately related in time, and the former is cited in the latter. These facts materially confirm the probability of Chavannes' hypothesis and suggest that the theorem likewise was derived by the Chinese from the Greeks.

Professor L. CARRINGTON GOODRICH, of Columbia University: An Incident in Sino-Korean Relations. Remarks by Dr. Hummel.

The Hon. W. W. Rockhill wrote in 1905 (*China's Intercourse with Korea from the XVth century to 1895*) that from 1392 to 1882 "China never overstepped the bounds" of her "admission of Korea's right to self-government, . . . nor interfered in the management of the country." This paper will treat a single case of interference, in the years 1396-1398. Ku Chieh-kang has recently suggested that events were rapidly leading to war between the two countries, only the death of the emperor (the founder of the Ming dynasty) and domestic strife in China intervening.

Miss NANCY LEE SWANN, of the Gest Chinese Research Library: An inter-library loan-group in the Greater Hang-chou, middle 18th Century. Remarks by Dr. Ch'iu.

Of the great private libraries in China in the eighteenth century more than half of them are said to have been located in the province of Chekiang. Within the metropolitan area of its capital, the old historic city of Hang-chou, there was an intimate group of at least seven owners of large private libraries who borrowed and lent accessions. They exchanged visits, they discussed the preservation of their books; they vied with one another in poetical compositions as well as scholarly research. They practised inter-library loan for the purposes of studying and copying rare books, both those in manuscript and in print, which they as individual owners had not secured for their collections.

Dr. SHIO SAKANISHI, of the Library of Congress: A Study of the Census Domicile Record of the Slaves owned by the Todaiji Monastery in 772. Remarks by Dr. Reischauer.

Between the years 750 and 772 the Todaiji Monastery received two hundred and two male and female slaves from the following four sources: 158 from the central government, 3 from the provinces, 23 through purchase, and 18 from Oyake no Kazemaro. However, fourteen slaves ran away, and at the time of census, the temple owned only 188 slaves. The present study is a detailed analysis of the record through the contemporary documents.

Mr. GEORGE A. KENNEDY, of Yale University: The Phonetics of a rural Chekiang Dialect. Remarks by Professor Elisséeff.

The dialects into which spoken Chinese is divided offer a rich field for the student of phonetics, and the work hitherto done represents only a beginning. The dialects best known to westerners have been necessarily those of the coastal cities and large centers, where much intermingling of speech forms has taken place. It might therefore be expected to prove interesting if the more secluded and isolated dialects were examined, and the paper in question takes up a rural dialect of Chekiang, spoken only in a very small area. The phonetic system is described and is probable course of development from earlier Chinese indicated.

Dr. A. KAIMING CH'U, of Harvard University: Laufer on the Introduction of Spectacles into China. Remarks by Professor Elisséeff.

The object of this note is to verify some of the Chinese works mentioned and statements made by Laufer in his article, "Zur Geschichte der Brille" in *Mitteilungen zur Geschichte der Medizin und der Naturwissenschaften*, VI Bd. No. 4 (1907), S. 379-385, which article was used by Dr. George Sarton as the principal source for his Chinese account of the Invention of Spectacles in his *Introduction to the History of Science*, vol. II, pp. 1024-1025.

THE FOURTH SESSION

The fourth session was called to order at 2.15 P. M., and the following papers were read:

Miss ARDELIA RIPLEY HALL, of the Boston Museum of Fine Arts: Three Bas-reliefs of the late Han Dynasty in the Boston Museum (illustrated). Remarks by Dr. Bull.

Our knowledge of Chinese sculpture is extended by the appearance of three monumental bas-reliefs, hitherto unknown, of the Late Han Dynasty. They have recently been acquired by the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston. Illustrated.

The Corresponding Secretary read a reply from Professor Lanman to the telegram sent him the previous day in the name of the Society.

On motion it was unanimously voted to send to Professor R. J. H. Gottheil the congratulations of the Society on his fiftieth anniversary as a member and the regret of the members at his absence.

At this point President Albright introduced President James Rowland Angell of Yale University who cordially and felicitously welcomed the Society to New Haven.

The following papers were then read:

Mr. G. ERNEST WRIGHT, of the Johns Hopkins University: Chronology of the early Bronze Age in Palestine. Remarks by Professor Albright.

The recently published reports of the excavations at Jericho and Ai enable us to modify the previous attempts to bring order into the hitherto confused state of the Palestinian Early Bronze Age culture, a start toward which had been made following excavations at Megiddo and Beth-shan. Isolated deposits such as the ceramic culture of the Gezer troglodytes and the beautiful painted ware from Ophel can now be dated with some degree of certainty. Though there are direct connections with Egypt, it is interesting to note that throughout this period Palestine is really a "backwater" for cultures dominant north of her.

Professor NELSON GLUECK, of the Hebrew Union College: The Theophany of the God of Sinai. Remarks by President Morgenstern and Professor Meek.

An examination of the Biblical passages which deal with the theophany of the God of Sinai reveals the fact that not one of them can be assigned to the pre-exilic period. This holds true also for Judges 5, 3-5 with their description of the disturbed phenomena of nature which accompany the appearance of Yahweh coming from Se'ir and Edom in behalf of His people. Se'ir and Edom in these passages are to be identified with Sinai. All of the passages which regard Edom and Se'ir as extending west of the 'Arabah must be assigned to the late exilic and post-exilic periods.

Dr. ARNOLD A. BAKE, of Holland: Indian Music.

Professor A. GOETZE, of Yale University: Some Observations on the Representation of the Semitic Sibilants in Old Babylonian. Remarks by Professors Albright, Speiser, and Meek, and President Morgenstern.

Orthographic details in the Code of Hammurabi prove that Old Babylonian made a distinction between the sibilants derived from Sem. *ṣ* and from Sem. *š* which later on both dropped together in Akkad. *š*. An indication as to the phonetic nature of the sound representing

Sem. *ʔ* can be found in the fact that this very sound serves to express the doubling of *s* (corresponding to Sem. *samekh*).

Professor W. NORMAN BROWN, of the University of Pennsylvania: A Hindu Manual of Magic and Ritual for Thieves. Remarks by President Morgenstern, and Professors Archer, Albright, and Sapir.

Statement concerning the contents of the *Ṣaṃmukhakaḷpa*. This text, although primarily devoted to magical and ritualistic formulae for thieves, considerably enlarges our knowledge of scientific thievery in ancient India. The work is known in only a single manuscript.

Professor E. SAPIR, of Yale University: Loan Words in Western Asia Minor. Remarks by Professors Albright, Sturtevant, and Speiser.

The importance of loan-words, as distinct from cognates, in certain languages in western Asia Minor is illustrated by: 1. A Semitic loan-word in Karian; 2. certain Semitic loan-words in Cypriote Greek; 3. certain loan-words, or presumable loan-words, between Tocharian and Hittite and Tocharian and Greek, the inference being that the prototype of Tocharian was spoken in western Asia Minor.

Mr. Z. S. HARRIS, of the University of Pennsylvania: Back-formation of *ʔtn* in Phoenician and Ras Shamra. Remarks by Professors Albright and Goetze.

The verbal root *ʔtn* "give" occurs only in Phoenician and Ras Shamra. The original form of the root was *ntn* even in these languages, as it is elsewhere in West Semitic. But this is the one root except the *Iy* which has an *i*-Imperfect. In the Imperative the form, having the *i*-vowel and minus the *n*-, was identical with that from *Iy* roots. By back-formation a new Imperfect was created on the analogy of the *Iy* (> *Ii*) verbs, and thence a new Perfect: *ʔtn*.

THE FIFTH SESSION

The fifth session was called to order at 9.15 on Friday morning.

THE NEXT ANNUAL MEETING

The Corresponding Secretary announced that the next annual meeting of the Society would be held at Cleveland, Ohio, at the invitation of the Cleveland Museum of Art and of Western Reserve University, in the neighborhood of Easter 1937, the exact days to be fixed by the Executive Committee.

THE COMMITTEE FOR THE PROMOTION OF ORIENTAL RESEARCH

In the absence of Professor Bender, chairman of the committee, the Corresponding Secretary read the following report of the Committee for the Promotion of Oriental Research:

The Standing Committee for the Promotion of Oriental Research, consisting of Professors Bender (Chairman) and Montgomery, and Dr. Hummel, reported to the Directors of the Society at their meeting Tuesday evening, the 14th of April, 1936, on the second year of its work. The committee reported substantial progress in the securing of funds for research projects in the Oriental field. In at least six cases the committee aided in obtaining such funds, and in several cases operated alone. The endorsements of the first year were followed up, and one new project was added. Reports on these various projects, as soon as they are ready for public announcement, will be found in the JOURNAL under the heading: NOTES OF THE SOCIETY.

The committee reaffirmed its policy, as outlined a year ago, and renewed its suggestion that the Society set aside or try to secure a sum of money, however small, to be used for research, so that the committee could offer some contribution from the Society when it asks for financial support of a project backed by the Society.

The committee reported that available funds for research are diminishing, but that there are still openings for matured and important projects. Such projects should be submitted to Professor Harold H. Bender, Princeton University, Chairman of the Committee.

In the absence of Professor Olmstead, the Society's representative on the board of the American Schools of Oriental Research, Professor Burrows, President of the Schools, reported on their activities.

REPORT OF DELEGATES TO THE COUNCIL OF LEARNED SOCIETIES

The Corresponding Secretary read the report of the Society's Delegates to the American Council of Learned Societies Devoted to Humanistic Studies:

The Council met in Washington, D. C., in the Mayflower Hotel, on January 31st and February 1st, 1936. The meetings were interesting and valuable. In addition to the delegates of the Society, a number of other members of the Society were present, including Messrs. Sturtevant, Kent, Barret, Albright, Clark, and Michelson.

The most important matter discussed at the business meetings was the exhaustion of the fluid funds of the Council, due to the failure of the Foundations to make further grants. This had been anticipated for some time. However, the Permanent Secretary of the Council, Mr. Leland,

announced that the Rockefeller Foundation had reversed a previous decision, and had made a grant sufficient to care for the Administrative Budget of the Council for three years, and that funds for specific projects might possibly be secured in the future. He pointed out that the change would probably be beneficial to the larger functions of the Council, which would change from an organization primarily interested in distributing funds, to one devoted to planning for the general development of the Humanities. There was considerable discussion of various economies, without much definite result. The funds available for general purposes in 1936 amount to \$69,880.00, of which about \$40,000.00 can be used for general purposes and commitments of 1936. In addition to planning and administration, and projects provided for by balances, a number of new appropriations were made, including those for the Linguistic Atlas of New England, for the study of American Native Languages, for the Census of Medieval and Renaissance Manuscripts, and for six projects of the Union Académique Internationale. A subvention of \$25,000.00 was made for fellowships and/or grants-in-aid in 1936-37.

A number of volumes recently published under the auspices of the Council were exhibited.

Minutes were read concerning the following scholars who had died in 1935: James H. Breasted, James F. Willard, Milman Parry, Henri Pierrenne, and A. B. Drachmann.

The delegates to the meeting of the Union Académique Internationale at Copenhagen reported that the academies of Germany and Austria had been admitted to membership.

An innovation at the meetings, made possible by the absence of financial business, was the holding of discussion sessions. Although three were scheduled, only two were actually held, on "The Humanities in American Universities and Colleges" and "The Role of the Research Councils in the Intellectual Organization and Activities of the Nation." There seemed to be differences of opinion as to the value of these discussions. The reports of planning committees and activities included interesting reports from the Committees on Chinese and Japanese Studies, on Indic and Iranian Studies, and on the Summer Seminar in Arabic and Islamic Studies.

N. SCHMIDT
J. K. SHEYOOK.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON RESOLUTIONS

Professor Montgomery, for himself and his colleagues Professors W. H. P. Hatch and Meek, presented the following minute of the Committee on Resolutions:

The American Oriental Society puts on record its deep appreciation of the very generous courtesy of the President and Fellows of Yale University and of their hospitality on the occasion of the 148th Meeting of the Society.

Ancient ties connecting the Society with Yale University have made the present session a veritable home-coming.

Our grateful thanks are also due to the Library and the Gallery of Fine Arts of the University for the several carefully prepared special exhibits of great interest in the various fields of members of the Society.

Finally, and not least, we have enjoyed the delightful hospitality of the Oriental Club, the courteous facilities of the Faculty Club, and the spirit of friendship manifested on all sides by the members of the University.

On motion the minute was unanimously adopted.

On motion of Professor Edgerton the following minute was passed.

The Society records its grateful appreciation of the years of faithful and efficient labor devoted to its service by LeRoy C. Barret, Ludlow Bull, and John Clark Archer, who are now retiring from the offices of Corresponding Secretary, Recording Secretary, and Treasurer, respectively.

On motion of Professor Kent it was voted that the Society's Committee on Investments, in investing the Society's permanent funds, is not restricted to securities which, under whatever laws apply, are legal investments for trust funds, but may use the judgment of its members without their incurring liability for depreciation or loss of value of the securities purchased.

At this point Vice-president Ogden took the chair and the following papers were read:

Mr. M. A. SIMSAR, of Philadelphia. Three rare Manuscripts from the John Frederick Lewis Collection. Remarks by Professor Kent and Dr. Ogden.

In cataloguing the John Frederick Lewis collection of Oriental Manuscripts in the Free Library of Philadelphia, I have come across three manuscripts of unusual historical interest. The first, the Last Will and Testament of Ahmad Pasha, the Grand Vizir of Sultan Bayazid II, who reigned from 1481 to 1512, is a rare and unique Turkish document. It bears the date of 917 A. H. (1512 A. D.). The second, a bequest of Shah Sultan Hussein Safavi of Iran, who reigned from 1694 to 1721, bears the seal of the Shah himself and of three other court dignitaries. The date given is 1118 A. H. (1706 A. D.). The third, which comes from India, is a poem in Persian in praise of Ali, the fourth Caliph, and bears the seal of Jansipar Khan, the Turkoman Amir and contemporary of the last of the Mughal Emperors, Aurengzib. The manuscript is dated 1122 A. H. (1711 A. D.). These manuscripts reveal many historical facts which will be of interest to historians and scholars.

Dr. MOSHE BAR AM, of Yale University: The Method of indicating the Subjunctive in Cappadocian Texts. Remarks by Professors Meek, Sturtevant, Edgerton, Albright, and Goetze.

Analysis of the subjunctive verbal forms in the Cappadocian texts reveals that the accepted view that the enclitic *-ni* is the general mark for the subjunctive in Cappadocian is wrong. The mark is *-u* affixed to third radical. Only under certain conditions is the enclitic *-ni* the mark. The Cappadocian method can be formulated in two rules. Illustrative examples, a comparison between the Assyrian, Babylonian, and Cappadocian methods, and a discussion of the chronological development of the subjunctive in the Akkadian dialects will be given.

Professor GEORGE VERNADSKY, of Yale University: Notes on the History of the Ugurs in the late Middle Ages. Remarks by Professor McGovern and Dr. Ogden.

Present state of research on the history and civilization of the Ugurs. Source material. Ugur juridical documents published by the Academy of Sciences of U. S. S. R.

The historical background. The rôle of the Ugurs in the formation of the Great Mongol Empire of the 13th century. Probability of the influence of Ugur law on medieval Russian law.

Dismemberment of the Mongol Empire. Struggle for the control of Eastern Turkestan between different branches of the House of Chingis Khan. The attitude of the Ugurs.

Ugurs under Mongol rule. Administration of the Khan and of native authorities. Taxation. The petition of the domaine gardeners to the Khan, Toghluk Timur, about tax exemption (around 1359).

Dr. CYRUS H. GORDON, of Johns Hopkins University: New Tablets from Tell el-Amarna.

In 1933-34 the expedition of the Egypt Exploration Society, under the direction of Mr. J. S. Pendlebury, discovered eight cuneiform tablets at Tell el-Amarna. They include a letter from Egypt to Palestine and another from Syria, a fragment of an epic, a list of gods including some new deities, a vocabulary of the *id/ A/ na-a-qu*, and other "school texts" used in the academy for scribes at Tell el-Amarna.

Professor FERRIS J. STEPHENS, of Yale University: An Inscription dedicated to the Divine Seven. Remarks by Dr. Gordon, and Professors Goetze and Albright.

The paper is a discussion of a recently acquired brief votive inscription in the Yale Babylonian Collection. It is unique among inscriptions of its type, in that it is dedicated to the Babylonian deities, known simply as "The Seven." It gives further information about Hashmargalshu, a ruler, whose name appears only on this, and one other inscription, also in the Yale Babylonian Collection.

Dr. F. V. WINNETT, of the University of Toronto: Some recent Researches in Lihyanite and Thamudic. Remarks by Professors Albright and Goetze.

A brief critical résumé of some of the recent work in this field and the results of some researches by myself, showing that the inscriptions labelled "Lihyanite" can be divided into three script-groups, those labelled "Thamudic" into five, and that our accepted alphabetical tables, both Lihyanite and Thamudic, stand in need of considerable revision. Evidence will also be drawn from the Lihyanite texts to prove that the full form of the article *ha* was *han*.

Professor KURT F. LEIDECHE, of Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute: The Bhagavad-gīta and the St. Louis Movement.

As an enzyme in American Literature the Bhagavad Gītā is generally acknowledged during the Emerson-Thoreau period of Concord, Mass. The reaction that set in to the broadness of New England transcendentalism, and its causal relationship with the St. Louis Movement, one of America's greatest intellectual movements in the past century, is very little known. The paper is based on published and unpublished work of Wm. T. Harris, pivot of the movement, and attempts to relate the peculiar attitudes with the spiritual and economic conditions preceding and following the Civil War and the educational adjustments necessary in the last quarter of the 19th century.

The following papers were read by title:

Professor R. J. H. GOTTFRED, of Columbia University: Fragments of a Commentary on the Medical Work of Rhazes.

Miss TERESINA ROWELL, of Carleton College: The relation of the Adhiṣṭhāna-power to the Projection of Nirmanē-kāyas in the Saddharma-puṇḍarīca and other Mahayana Buddhist Scriptures.

The myriad Tathāgata-vigrahas (Budda-forms) of *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka* XV are projected by the One Buddha through *adhiṣṭhāna-power*. In Pali this is called *adhiṣṭhānā-iddhi*, the sage of Buddha's power of projecting duplicates of himself—"nimitta-Buddhas"—probable precursors of the Mahayana *Nirmāṇa-kāyas* which are projected by the Dharma-kāya to enlighten creatures. This clarifies the meaning of (1) the "manifestation of all the Buddha-fields as one field" in the *Lotus*, *Lalitavistara* and elsewhere; and (2) the relation of the three Kāyas (*Dharma-kāya*, *Sambhoga-kāya*, and *Nirmāṇa-kāya*) to each other and to the Buddha-fields.

Professor FRANK R. BLAKE, of Johns Hopkins University: a) Spanish hasta. b) A Bibliography of the Semitic Languages.

(a) It has long been recognized that this word is derived from Arabic *hatta*. It occurs in Old Spanish as *ata*, *fata*, but what the s

of the later form *hasta* is, has never been satisfactorily explained. It is not unlikely that it is due to the analogy of the synonymous *usque* which while not preserved in written Spanish may have existed in the spoken speech for a time alongside of the borrowed *ata*. Perhaps the *s* form originated first in the combination *ata que*.

(b) No satisfactory separate bibliography of this subject with any claim to completeness exists at present, though many partial lists have been compiled. Such a bibliography I am preparing with the help of several of my students. It will not only list the authors, titles, etc., but will contain also a brief statement of content in every case where this is not clear from the title.

Professor C. D. MATTHEWS, of Birmingham Southern College: An Edition of the Kitāb-Aimān al-'Arab of an-Najīramī.

Professor J. D. PRINCE, of Columbia University: Turkic Material in Hungarian.

The object of this article is to call attention to the cognate and rich loan material occurring in the agglutinative fundamentally Asiatic Magyar language. Much of the so-called loan words are to be regarded as cognates with Turkic in the Magyar rather than direct borrowings, as was for example the case with the Slav loan-material in Hungarian. (Cf. my recent article on this subject in the *Proc. of the American Philos. Soc.*, 75, No. 7, 1935, pp. 591-601).

Professor A. ARTHUR SCHILLER, of Columbia University: The Administration of Native Customary Law in the Netherlands East Indies.

Mr. A. S. HALKIN, of Columbia University: Al-Ash'ari's Defense of Kalām.

Beset by bitter opponents from the ranks of the strictly Orthodox, the Mu'tazilites and the philosophers, Ash'arite Kalām was compelled to defend its position by stressing that inquiry was permissible and that its doctrines satisfied the requirements of the Orthodox faith as well as of logical reasoning. Such a defense, entitled *Risālat fi Istihṣān al-khawḍ fil-Kalām* (Hyderabad, 1323), has been ascribed to al-Ash'ari. The authorship is open to serious doubts. The thesis of the epistle is that (1) if the Prophet has not specifically permitted Kalām he has not specifically forbidden it either; (2) actually many Kalāmistic problems are suggested in the Kur'ān; (3) the Prophet's silence on these problems is explicable on the basis of the conditions of his time.

Professor A. V. WILLIAMS JACKSON, of Columbia University: The Etymology of some Pahlavi Words in the Manichaean Text T III 260.

The paper discusses the etymology of three difficult TPh L. words in the Manichaean text T III 260 (Andreas-Henning) *Mitteliranische*

Manichaica aus Chinesisch-Turkestan, I, Berlin, 1932, namely, *hpsyrd* (e 2 verso 1, line 25), *'skrost* (b 1 recto 1, line 13), *rḥnguh* (a 1 verso 2, line 2).


Professor GEORGE A. BARTON, of the University of Pennsylvania: Origin of the Thought-pattern which has survived in Baptism. Published JOURNAL 56. 155.

Professor G. W. BRIGGS, of Drew University: The Harijan and Hinduism.

Professor E. R. HARDY, of General Theological Seminary: Coptic Homilies and Egyptian Ethics.

To the sources which are investigated for evidences of continuity between paganism and Christianity in Egypt must be added the increasingly available Coptic homiletic literature. The same virtues and vices which figure prominently in classical Egyptian ethical writings are stressed by Coptic preachers. This may be due to continuity of tradition; or perhaps further study will show that the continuity of conditions of life in Egypt is enough to account for it.

Professor J. C. REICH, of Dropsie College: The Dr. Elkan Adler Papyri, Nos. 31 and 32. Published JOURNAL 56. 258.



PROCEEDINGS
OF THE
MIDDLE WEST BRANCH
OF THE
American Oriental Society
AT THE MEETING AT CHICAGO, 1936

The sessions of the Twentieth Annual Meeting of the Middle West Branch of the Society were held at Presbyterian Theological Seminary, Chicago, on Friday and Saturday, March 27 and 28, 1936. The Friday morning and evening sessions were held in the Commons, the Friday afternoon and Saturday morning sessions in the Chapel. The following members were present at one or more sessions:

Albert, A. D., Jr.	Geers	Olmstead
Bechtel	Gelb	Price
Blank	Grant	Pyatt
Bobrinskoy	Gruenthaner	Robinson, G. L.
Bowman	Hallock, R. T.	Schaeffer
Boyes	Hamilton	Schurman, Miss
Braden	Habas	Sellers
Buckler	Hardy	Simcox
Cameron	Hughes	Smeaton, Miss
Creel	Irwin	Sprengling
Debevoise	Jacobson	Stefanski, Miss
Dubberstein	Johnson, S. E.	Waterman
Edgerton, W. F.	Johnson, Mrs. S. E.	Wicker, Miss
Engberg	Joshi	Wilkins, Miss
Feigin	Kraft	Williams, W. G.
Field	May	Willett
Fuller	Newey	Wilson
		Total 51

There were present also the following nominees for membership in the Society: Prof. Ludwig Bachhofer, Mr. Taha Baqir, Dr. Adolph A. Brux, Rev. Roger T. Burton, Mr. Paul J. Keller, Mr. R. A. Martin, Mr. Joseph Mihelic, Miss Cleta Margaret Olmstead, Mr. James D. Paul, Miss Ann Perkins, Mr. Fuad Safar, Mr. Maurice D. Schwartz, Miss Dorothy M. Stehle, Dr. Nabia Abbott, Mrs. Ruth Stelhorn Mackensen—Total 15.

Professor Henri Frankfort, Director of the Oriental Institute excavations in Iraq, was the guest of the Branch and gave a paper.

At every session there were present students, wives of members, and others interested in the programs.

THE FIRST SESSION

At 9.30 A. M. on Friday President M. Sprengling called to order the first session of the meeting in the Social Room of the Commons. Reading of the minutes of the meeting at Ann Arbor in 1935 was omitted, since they were already in print. The report of the Treasurer was given as follows:

Balance on hand reported at last meeting		\$22.36
Expenditures:		
Stamps and envelopes.....	\$10.38	
Mimeographing preliminary circular	1.00	
Telephone calls.....	.50	
Printing final circular.....	13.90	25.78
		<hr/>
Deficit		\$ 3.42

The President appointed Professor Price and Dr. Debevoise as an Auditing Committee. He also appointed Dr. Williams, Professor Hamilton, and Mr. Newey as the Committee on Resolutions. The Branch elected Dr. Cameron, Mr. Hallock, and Professor Sellers as the Committee on Nominations.

There followed the reading of papers.

Rev. PAUL S. NEWEX, of the Assyrian Evangelical Church, Chicago: *Light on Difficult Texts of the Bible from Syriac Versions*. Remarks by Drs. Blank and Feigin, Professors Sprengling and Pyatt.

Professor H. G. MAY, of the Graduate School of Theology, Oberlin: *Interpretation of the Names of Hosea's Children*. Remarks by Drs. Williams and Feigin.

Professor W. A. IRWIN, of the University of Chicago: *The Elihu Speeches in the Criticism of the Book of Job*.

Professor A. T. OLMSTEAD, of the University of Chicago: *Intertestamental Studies*. Remarks by Mr. Newey and Dr. Blank. Published JOURNAL 56. 242.

Mr. ALLEN D. ALBERT, JR., of the Seabury-Western Theological Seminary: *The Beginning of the Ancient Oriental City*. Remarks by Professors Olmstead and Buckler.

Mr. C. E. SIMCOX, of the Graduate School of Theology, Oberlin: *The Rôle of Cyrus in Deutero-Isaiah*. Remarks by Professor Olmstead.

Dr. SAMUEL I. FEIGIN, of the University of Chicago: "Shamash son of Yahveh smote the men of Beth-Shemesh."

At 12.45 P. M. the members and nominees were guests of Presbyterian Theological Seminary at lunch in the Faculty Room of the Commons. President John Timothy Stone of the Seminary gave a brief address of welcome.

THE SECOND SESSION

At 2.00 P. M. President Sprengling called to order the second session in the Seminary Chapel. The reading of papers was resumed.

Dr. WALDO H. DUBBERSTEIN, of the University of Chicago: The Social Order of Chaldean and Persian Babylonia.

Dr. HAROLD W. JACOBSON, of the University of Chicago: An Early History of Sogdiana.

Dr. I. J. GELB, of the University of Chicago: Assyro-Babylonian Geographical Sources.

Professor IRA M. PRICE, of the University of Chicago: A Stray Cuneiform Tablet. Remarks by Professor May, Drs. Feigin and Cameron.

At 3.10 Professor Sprengling read the Presidential Address on "Arab and Ark; Tent and Tables of Stone."

After the Presidential Address the wives of the local Committee on Arrangements served light refreshments and some of the members visited the Seminary's museum of Palestinian archaeology.

THE THIRD SESSION

At 5.00 P. M. Vice-President Sheldon H. Blank called to order the third session in the West Class Room of the Chapel building. The reading of papers was resumed.

Miss ELIZABETH STEFANSKI, of the University of Chicago: The Correspondence of Apa Frange.

Miss CLETA MARGARET OLNSTEAD, of the University of Chicago: Style in Oriental Art (Illustrated).

Dr. N. C. DEBEVOISE, of the University of Chicago: A New Early Arabic Luster Bowl from Tell Asmar (Illustrated).

Miss ANN PERKINS, of the University of Chicago: Beads as Material for History. Remarks by Professors Frankfort and Sellers.

At 6.15 P. M. there was the Annual Subscription Dinner in the Faculty Room of the Commons. After the meal Professor Hamilton of the Committee on Resolutions presented the following:

The members and friends of the Middle West Branch of the American Oriental Society, assembled at Presbyterian Theological Seminary, Chicago, on March 27, 1936, have felt most deeply the passing from their midst of James Henry Breasted, late Director of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, esteemed Founder and first President of this Branch of the American Oriental Society. Friend, inspirer of young students, masterly scholar, he has left us a permanent and significant inheritance in his creative spirit.

RESOLVED THEREFORE: that this statement be recorded and that a copy be sent to the members of Dr. Breasted's family.

The resolution was adopted by all the members' standing in tribute to Professor Breasted.

Professor Olmstead, who was the first Secretary of the Branch, then spoke on the founding of the Branch, its early years, and its growth.

THE FOURTH SESSION

At 8.00 P. M. the President called to order the fourth session in the Main Dining Room of the Commons. There proceeded the reading of papers.

Miss WINIFRED SMEATON, of the University of Michigan: Tattooing among the Arabs of Iraq. Remarks by Professor Olmstead.

Mr. HENRY FIELD, of the Field Museum of Natural History: the Peoples of Iraq (Illustrated). Remarks by Mrs. Mackensen and Professor Price.

Professor W. F. Edgerton, of the University of Chicago: A Problem in the History of Egyptian Art (Illustrated). Remarks by Miss Olmstead and Professor Sprengling. Published JOURNAL 56. 178.

Professor F. W. BUCKLER, of the Graduate School of Theology, Oberlin: Pseudo-Eusebius' *De Stella* and its Historical Significance.

Professor C. S. BRADEN, of Northwestern University: Marco Polo on Oriental Religions. Remarks by Professor Buckler and Dr. Creel.

Dr. HENRI FRANFORT, of the University of Chicago: Excavations in Iraq in 1935-36.

THE FIFTH SESSION

At 9.35 Saturday morning the President called to order the fifth session in the West Class Room of the Chapel building and the reading of papers was resumed.

Mr. RICHARD T. HALLOCK, of the University of Chicago. The Syllabary Text Rm. 2, 588. Remarks by Professor Edgerton.

Mr. ROBERT M. ENGBERG, of the University of Chicago: Notes on Palestine in the Second Millennium B. C. Remarks by Professor Sprengling, May, and Waterman.

Professor L. E. FULLER, of Garrett Biblical Institute: The Inner Struggles of Jeremiah. Remarks by Professor Schaeffer.

Professor L. WATERMAN, of the University of Michigan: The Martyred Servant Motif in Is. 53. Remarks by Professor May.

Dr. SHELDON H. BLANK, of Hebrew Union College: A Re-examination of Some Biblical Sources for the Relations between Judah and Moab and Ammon. Remarks by Professor Sellers.

Dr. H. G. CREEL, of the University of Chicago: A New Theory of the Origin of the Chinese Deity *T'ien*, "Heaven." Remarks by Professor Hamilton. Published JOURNAL 56.335.

Professor C. H. HAMILTON, of the Graduate School of Theology, Oberlin: An English Translation of Hsüan Tsang's *Wei-shih-er-shih-lun*.

Dean FREDERICK C. GRANT, of Seabury-Western Theological Seminary: Form Criticism.

Dr. R. A. BOWMAN, of the University of Chicago: An Aramaic Oracle in Lucian.

The following papers were read by title:

Professor MOSES BUTTENWIESER, of Hebrew Union College: Deutero-Isaiah's Estimate of Cyrus.

Dr. W. G. WILLIAMS, of the Union Ave. M. E. Church, Cleveland, Ohio: The Punic Sections in Plautus' *Poenulus*.

Dr. SHERMAN E. JOHNSON, of Seabury-Western Theological Seminary: Septuagint Translation Phenomenon and the New Testament.

Dr. NARIA ABBOTT, of the University of Chicago: The Monasteries of the Fayyum.

Dr. A. R. SIEBENS, of the First Presbyterian Church, Bowling Green, Ohio: Desuetude as a Factor in Dating Biblical Law.

Dr. Cameron, presented a majority report of the Committee on Nominations. The report was reported and the following officers were declared elected for the year 1936-37.

President: Professor OVID R. SELLERS, of Presbyterian Theological Seminary, Chicago.

Vice-President: Professor CLARENCE H. HAMILTON, of the Graduate School of Theology, Oberlin, Ohio.

Secretary-Treasurer: Mr. ALLEN D. ALBERT, JR., of the Seabury-Western Theological Seminary, Evanston, Ill.

Members of the Executive Committee: Professor M. SPRENGLING and Dr. N. C. DEBEVOISE, of the University of Chicago.

Professor Price offered the following report of the Auditing Committee:

The Report of the Treasurer has been examined in every detail and found correct.

Auditing Committee,

IRA M. PRICE,

NEILSON C. DEBEVOISE.

The report of the Committee was accepted and the report of the Treasurer approved.

RESOLVED: That we, the members of the Middle West Branch of the American Oriental Society, assembled at Chicago, desire to express our heartfelt appreciation and sincere thanks to President John Timothy Stone and the Faculty of the Presbyterian Theological Seminary for their generous hospitality throughout the sessions of its Twentieth Annual Meeting on March 27 and 28, 1936; and that the Secretary be instructed to transmit our vote to the President and the Faculty; and that the Branch recognizes its indebtedness for the success of the meeting to the excellent planning of Professors Robinson and Sellers, who constituted the Committee on Local Arrangements.

Resolved further that we, the members of the Middle West Branch on occasion of retirement of Professor Sellers from the office of Secretary-Treasurer, record our deep appreciation of his long and faithful service in that capacity. It has been a rare good fortune to the Branch that a man of his outstanding position should have been willing to devote so many years to a task so onerous and self-sacrificing and yet so important for the welfare of the organization.

Resolved further that the Executive Committee plan to extend the length of our meetings in order to allow more time for presentation of papers and discussion.

WALTER G. WILLIAMS,
CLARENCE H. HAMILTON,
PAUL S. NEWEX.

These resolutions were adopted and ordered put into the minutes.

With the understanding that the time and place of the Twenty-first Annual Meeting be left in the hands of the Executive Committee, the Branch adjourned at 12.55 P. M.

CONSTITUTION AND BY-LAWS

OF THE

AMERICAN ORIENTAL SOCIETY

REVISED FORM ADOPTED APRIL 15, 1936

CONSTITUTION

NAME

ARTICLE I. This Society shall be called the AMERICAN ORIENTAL SOCIETY.

OBJECTS

ARTICLE II. The objects contemplated by this society shall be:—

1. The cultivation of learning in the Asiatic, African, and Polynesian languages, as well as the encouragement of researches of any sort by which the knowledge of the East may be promoted.
2. The cultivation of a taste for Oriental studies in this country.
3. The publication of memoirs, translations, vocabularies, and other communications, presented to the Society, which may be valuable with reference to the before-mentioned objects.
4. The collection of a library and cabinet.

MEMBERSHIP AND ELECTION

ARTICLE III. The membership of the Society shall consist of corporate members, honorary members, and honorary associates.

ARTICLE IV. SECTION 1. Honorary members may be elected only upon recommendation of the Executive Committee and the vote of not less than three-fourths of the members present at an annual meeting. No further honorary associates shall be elected.

SECTION 2. Corporate members shall be elected by the Executive Committee. Each corporate member shall pay into the treasury of the Society an annual assessment of five dollars, but shall be exempt from obligation to make this annual payment in case he shall have made to the Society at any one time a donation of one hundred dollars less one half the amount he has paid in annual assessments. The Executive Committee may, for due cause, release members from the payment of annual assessments.

OFFICERS AND GOVERNMENT

ARTICLE V. SECTION 1. The officers of the Society shall be a President, a Vice-President, a Secretary, a Treasurer, a Librarian, an Editor, and two

Associate Editors. The officers shall be elected at the annual meeting for a term of one year.

SECTION 2. There shall be an Executive Committee consisting of the President, the Vice-President, the Secretary, the Treasurer, the Editor, the Presidents of Branches of the Society, and three other members of the Society, one of whom shall be elected at each annual meeting for a term of three years, and shall not be eligible for immediate re-election. Between meetings of the Society the Executive Committee shall have power to take any action that the Society itself could take; but all its acts must be reported to the Society at the next annual meeting. The Executive Committee may recommend action by the Society at the annual meeting, and it shall adopt a budget annually. The Secretary may on his own initiative, and shall at the request of any other member of the Committee, ask the Executive Committee to vote upon specific questions by mail, and if a majority of the Committee shall vote by mail for or against any measure thus submitted that vote shall be decisive; provided that any member of the Committee may demand that a proposal shall be discussed at a meeting of the Committee before final decision; in which case a mail vote shall be invalid.

ARTICLE VI. All Ex-Presidents of the Society and the Associate Editors shall be entitled to attend meetings of the Executive Committee, but they shall not vote except as hereinafter provided. If any member of the Executive Committee is unable to attend a meeting of the Committee he may appoint an Ex-President to vote in his stead, and the Editor may in like case appoint one of the Associate Editors. If at any meeting of the Executive Committee a member is absent and is not represented by a proxy of his own choice, the presiding officer of the Executive Committee may appoint an Ex-President to vote in his stead.

ARTICLE VII. The investment of the Society's permanent funds, including all donations made in accordance with Article IV, Section 2, shall be managed by a Committee on Investments, consisting of the Treasurer and two other members of the Society, to be appointed by the Executive Committee.

ARTICLE VIII. SECTION 1. The Editor shall have charge of the JOURNAL and of all other scientific publications of the Society, and shall supervise their publication within the limitation of the funds certified by the Treasurer as available for that purpose.

SECTION 2. The Associate Editors should represent provinces of the Oriental field in which the Editor is not a specialist. The Editor should consult with them in regard to matters falling within their respective competencies; but, in case of disagreement, the final decision shall rest with the Editor.

SECTION 3. The Treasurer shall act as business manager of the JOURNAL and all other publications of the Society.

MEETINGS

ARTICLE IX. The annual meeting of the Society shall be held in proximity to Easter, the precise time and place to be determined by the Executive Committee. One or more other meetings, at the discretion of the Executive Committee, may be held each year at such time and place as the Executive Committee shall determine.

BRANCHES OF THE SOCIETY

ARTICLE X. To provide for scientific meetings of groups of members living at too great a distance to attend the annual sessions of the Society, Branches may be organized with the approval of the Society. The details of organization are to be left to those forming a Branch thus authorized, subject to formal ratification by the Society.

AMENDMENTS

ARTICLES XI. This Constitution may be amended, on a recommendation of the Executive Committee, by a vote of three-fourths of the members present at an annual meeting, provided that notice of any proposed amendment shall have been sent to the members of the Society at least three weeks before the meeting at which it is to be considered.

BY-LAWS

FINANCE

I. The offices of Secretary and of Treasurer shall be combined and held by one person to be entitled the Secretary-Treasurer. He shall have general oversight of the welfare and business of the Society. He shall prepare and submit annually to the Executive Committee a budget for the ensuing year. He shall have authority to make contracts and to pay out money in accordance with the directions of the Executive Committee. He shall receive a stipend to be fixed by the Executive Committee, which stipend shall include the cost of his clerical assistance and other expenses.

II. The fiscal year of the Society shall correspond with the calendar year.

III. At each annual meeting the President shall appoint two auditors to examine the accounts of the Secretary-Treasurer and of the Committee on Investments. The Auditors shall perform their duty as soon as possible after January 1, and shall report to the Executive Committee before the next annual meeting of the Society.

PAPERS AND MANUSCRIPTS

IV. The Librarian shall keep a catalogue of all books belonging to the Society, with the names of donors, and shall at each annual meeting make a report of the accessions to the Library during the previous year, and shall be further guided in the discharge of his duties by such rules as the Executive Committee shall prescribe.

V. All papers read before the Society, and all manuscripts deposited by authors for publication, or for other purposes, shall be at the disposal of the Editor, unless notice to the contrary is given to the Editor at the time of presentation.

VI. Every member shall have the right to present papers to the Society. The papers actually to be read at any meeting shall be selected by a Program Committee consisting of the Secretary-Treasurer and two other members of the Society appointed by the President. This committee shall have power to plan and arrange the program in all details, including allotment of time to each paper.

THE JOURNAL

VII. Every member in regular standing shall be entitled to one copy of all numbers of the JOURNAL issued during his membership. Back volumes of the JOURNAL, so far as they are available, shall be furnished to members in regular standing at twenty per cent reduction from the list price.

MEMBERSHIP

VIII. Candidates for corporate membership who have been elected shall qualify as members by payment of the first annual assessment within one month from the time when notice of such election is mailed to them, or, in the case of persons not residing in the United States, within a reasonable time. A failure so to qualify, unless explained to the satisfaction of the Executive Committee, shall annul the election. If any corporate member shall for one year fail to pay his assessment, his name shall be removed from the mailing list of the JOURNAL; and if he shall fail to pay for two years, his name shall, after formal notification, be dropped from the list of members of the Society, unless the Executive Committee shall otherwise direct.

STANDING COMMITTEES

IX. *a.* There shall be a Nominating Committee of six members, three of whom shall be elected by the Society at each annual meeting to serve for two years. The members of this committee shall be ineligible for immediate re-election. The chairman of the committee shall be elected by the Society from among those members of the committee who have already served for one year of the term. This committee shall make nominations for all elective offices of the Society as provided in the Constitution and By-Laws, but nominations from the floor shall have equal standing.

IX. *b.* There shall be a standing Committee for the Promotion of Oriental Research, to consist of three members, each to hold office for a period of three years; one of whom shall be chosen annually by the Executive Committee. It shall plan and support meritorious projects in Oriental fields.

IX. *c.* There shall be a Committee on Membership, to be appointed by the Executive Committee, which shall systematically endeavor to secure new members. The Secretary-Treasurer shall be ex-officio a member of this committee.

IX. *d.* There shall be a Committee on the Enlargement of Resources, to be appointed by the Executive Committee, which shall seek additional financial support for the endowment funds and the current activities of the Society. The Secretary-Treasurer shall be ex-officio a member of this committee.

THE LIBRARY

X. *a.* The Library shall be accessible for consultation to all members of the Society, at such times as the Library of Yale College, with which it is deposited, shall be open for a similar purpose; further, to such persons as shall receive the permission of the Librarian, or of the Librarian or Assistant Librarian of Yale College.

X. *b.* Any member shall be allowed to draw books from the Library upon the following conditions: he shall give his receipt for them to the Librarian, pledging himself to make good any detriment the Library may suffer from their loss or injury, the amount of said detriment to be determined by the Librarian, with the assistance of the Secretary-Treasurer; and he shall return them within a time not exceeding three months from that of their reception, unless by special agreement with the Librarian this term shall be extended.

X. *c.* Persons not members may also be allowed to take and use the Society's books, under the conditions of the inter-library loan system.

BRANCHES OF THE SOCIETY

XI. *a.* Upon the formation of a Branch, as provided in the Constitution, the officers chosen shall have the right to propose for corporate membership in the Society such persons as may seem eligible to them, and, pending ratification according to Article IV of the Constitution, these candidates shall receive the JOURNAL and all notices issued by the Society.

XI. *b.* Within the provisions of the budget the Secretary-Treasurer of the Society shall forward to the Treasurer of each Branch funds sufficient to defray the expenses of the Branch. The accounts of the Treasurer of each Branch shall be audited annually, and a statement of the audit shall be included in the annual report of the Secretary-Treasurer of the Society.

AMENDMENTS

XII. These By-Laws may be amended by vote of a majority of the members present at any annual meeting.



1

“Der Göttliche Varahrana, der grosse Shahanshah der Kushanas”



2

Vāsudeva II

3

Vāsudeva II



4

Vāsudeva I

5

Vāsudeva I

6

Vāsudeva I



7

Kanishka III

8

Kanishka III

9

Kanishka III



10

Vāsudeva I



11

Vāsudeva II



12

Vāsudeva II



13

Vāsudeva II

HERRSCHER UND MÜNZEN DER SPÄTEN KUSHĀNAS

LUDWIG BACHHOFFER
UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO


DIE VERÖFFENTLICHUNG einiger Münzen aus dem "Don Hackin" durch Georges Bataille¹ und die grundlegende Arbeit Ernst Herzfelds² über die kushāno-sasanidischen Münzen haben die Aufmerksamkeit wieder in stärkerem Masse auf jene Münzen gelenkt, die von den Nachfolgern der Grossen Kushānas, also den Nachfolgern der Kanishka, Huvishka und Vāsudeva, ausgegeben worden sind; es sind das die einzigen Zeugnisse ihrer Existenz, die sich sonst mit zäher Beharrlichkeit im Dunkel zu halten vermochte. So liess man auch die Herrscherliste des einst so grossen und mächtigen Reiches immer mit Vāsudeva endigen, und begnügte sich mit der Behauptung, dass unter oder nach diesem Fürsten das Kushān Reich in Trümmer gegangen sei und eine Anzahl kleiner Fürstentümer sein Erbe angetreten habe. Herzfeld hat nun festgestellt, dass Ardashir I. zwischen 230-240 n. Chr. den Kushānas das Gebiet nördlich des Hindukush, also das alte Baktrien, abnahm, das sie seit dem letzten Viertel des ii. vorchristlichen Jahrhunderts in Besitz gehabt hatten. Die Sasaniden machten daraus eine Art Kronprovinz, die vom jeweiligen Thronfolger unter dem Titel *Kushanshah* oder *Kushan shahanshah* verwaltet wurde; es war damit auch das Recht der Münzprägung verbunden. Unter sasanidischer Herrschaft entstanden dort jene Münzen, die, vom numismatischen Standpunkt aus, allein die Bezeichnung kushāno-sasanidisch verdienen, schalenförmige Goldstücke, die sich eng an Kushān Münzen anschliessen, welche, nach der Legende, ein Vāsudeva ausgegeben hatte.



Die ältesten kushāno-sasanidischen Stücke zeigen Obv. einen stehenden König mit Vollbart, in Rüstung nach links, die Rechte ausgestreckt über einen kleinen Feueraltar, von dem der Rauch in Schnörkeln aufsteigt; hinter dem Altar ein halbmondbekrönter Dreizack mit Widerhaken. Der Fürst trägt auf dem Kopf eine

¹ Georges Batailles, "Notes sur la numismatique des Koushans et des Koushanshahs Sassanides," *Arethuse* 5 (1928). 19 ff.

² Ernst Herzfeld, "Kushano-sasanian Coins," *Memoirs of the Archaeological Survey of India*, Nr. 38 (Calcutta, 1930).

Krone aus zwei Perlenreihen, darüber einen blütenähnlichen Globus, "Sasanidenbinden," langes Schwert; die Linke ist auf einen langen Dreizack gestützt. Unter dem linken Arm meistens drei Punkte, im Feld das Zeichen *nandipada* (= Fusstapfen Nandins, das Symbol Sivas), zwischen den Beinen, die auf einer Standlinie stehen, ein Hakenkreuz. Rv. Šiva mit buschigem Haar und Vollbart, mit Diadem, in dünnem sasanidischen Gewand, in der Rechten Schlinge mit losen Enden, die Linke auf seinem Dreizack; er steht vor dem Stier Nandin, der nach links schaut, und berührt nur mit den Fusspitzen die Standlinie. Einfassung durch Perlenkranz, den der Kopf überschneidet.³ (Abb. 1)

Dieser kushāno-sasanidische Münztyp ist von einem andern, rein kushānischen abgeleitet, den Bataille dem Vāsudeva selbst, Herzfeld dem Vāsudeva oder einem seiner Nachfolger zuweist⁴: Obv. König nach links in Rüstung, spitze Krone mit Plakette über der Stirne, Rechte über Feueraltar, dahinter einfacher, kurzer Dreizack, langes Schwert; in der Linken langer Dreizack, unter dem linken Arm drei Punkte, daneben im Feld das Symbol *nandipada*, zwischen den Beinen Hakenkreuz; Standlinie; Nimbus, der nur auf der Seite des Gesichts erscheint. Rv. Šiva frontal, über dem Scheitel Halbmond, vor Nandin, der nach links sieht; in der Rechten Schlinge, in der Linken Dreizack. Kopf und Nimbus überschneiden den Perlenrand. Über dem rechten Arm, sehr korrupt, das Kushān Münzzeichen . Die Münze hat ausgesprochene Schalenform. (Abb. 2)

Nach besser erhaltenen Stücken lautet die Inschrift Obv.  = das shaonano shao Bazodeo koshano der früheren Münzen; Rv. . (Abb. 3) Die Darstellung der Figuren, der Symbole und die Schrift sind ausserordentlich roh, die davon abgeleiteten kushāno-sasanidischen Stücke stehen künstlerisch und technisch auf einer viel höheren Stufe.

Es ist kaum ein Zweifel möglich, dass der Kushān Herrscher, den die Sasaniden in Baktrien abgelöst hatten, den Namen Vāsudeva trug. Man fragt natürlich sofort, ob das der selbe Vāsudeva sei, der uns nach dem Zeugnis der Münzen und der Inschriften als der

³ Herzfeld, p. 42, Nr. 7. Pl. 2/7b. Nach Herzfelds Lesung handelt es sich um eine Münze des "Göttlichen Varahrana," der unter Shapur I. um 252 n. Chr. zur Regierung kam.

⁴ Bataille, p. 27; Herzfeld, p. 20.

Nachfolger des Huvishka in Nordwestindien bekannt ist; damit wird der Schauplatz der Untersuchung aus den Gebieten nördlich des Hindukush, woher die meisten der kushāno-sasanidischen Münzen stammen, nach dem Süden verlegt und wieder einmal das Problem der "Späten Kushānas" aufgerollt.

Die Münzen, die in irgend einer Form den Namen Vāsudeva tragen, gehen stilistisch ungewöhnlich weit auseinander. Bataille beschreibt die Unterschiede sehr treffend, hält aber daran fest, dass eine Scheidung in zwei Gruppen nicht möglich sei:

Certaines pièces sont petites, épaisses et gravées par un artiste fort habile; mais d'autres de même poids sont larges, en forme de petite coupe mince; leur gravure est grossière, l'écriture incorrecte. Ces différences ont semblé devoir justifier l'attribution des monnaies du second groupe à un second Vasu Deva, koushano-sassanide (Vincent A. Smith, *Cat. of the coins in the Indian Museum, Calcutta*, Oxford 1906, p. 91; S. B. Whitehead, *Cat. of Coins, I. Punjab Museum, Lahore*, Oxford, 1914, p. 212): en effet, leur forme et leur facture se rapprochent de celles des monnaies émises par des souveraines jusqu'ici mal déterminés qu'on désigne sous ce nom. Mais il est facile de montrer: 1° qu'aucune des monnaies de Vasu Deva ne présente le moindre caractère sassanide; 2° qu'il est impossible de les distinguer en deux groupes.⁵

Mit der ersten Behauptung ist Bataille sicher im Recht; jene Münzen mit dem Namen Vāsudeva sind nicht kushāno-sasanidisch, sondern rein kushānisch; die grosse Ähnlichkeit zwischen den beiden Ausgaben ist dem Umstand zu verdanken, dass die Sasaniden solche Vāsudeva-Münzen nachgeahmt hatten.

Zu der zweiten Behauptung ist zu bemerken, dass es auf den ersten Blick leicht und ganz selbstverständlich erscheint, die grosse Menge der Vāsudeva-Münzen in zwei Gruppen aufzuteilen, wovon die erste sich an die Ausgaben des Huvishka anlehnt, und die zweite schliesslich in die kushāno-sasanidische Gruppe übergeht. Hat man aber eine grössere Anzahl solcher Münzen geprüft, so zeigt sich, dass zwischen den beiden Gruppen so viel Gemeinsames besteht und so viele Übergänge sichtbar werden, dass es unmöglich scheint eine bestimmte Grenze zu ziehen. Dennoch glaube ich, dass Smith und Whitehead richtig gehandelt hatten, als sie, vielleicht rein gefühlsmässig, zwei verschiedene Vāsudevas nahmen.

Unbestreitbar hat jener Vāsudeva, der der Nachfolger des Hu-

⁵ Bataille, p. 26.

vishka ist und in den Inschriften der Jahre 74-98 der Kanishka-Ära genannt wird, die Münzen herausgegeben, die sich, wenigstens in einigen Rv.-Darstellungen, eng an die seines Vorgängers anschliessen.⁶ Für die Obv.-Darstellung nimmt er den bekannten Typ des Kanishka wieder auf, den stehenden König nach links, vor dem Feueraltar, in der Linken eine lange Lanze. Nimbus, Andeutung einer Standlinie.⁷ Die folgende Legende beginnt links unten, am Altar, der Strich bedeutet die Unterbrechung durch Kopf und Lanze: $\text{πασανοβαζα} / \text{εορηκοβαχο}$. Rv. Stehende weibliche Figur nach rechts, Halbmond über dem Scheitel, Nimbus, in der Rechten Schale, im linken Arm Szepter, das in einen halbkreisförmigen Bogen endigt.⁸ ΝΑΝΑ = Nanaia. Münzzeichen rechts: 𐎧𐎡𐎴 . (Abb. 4) An Stelle der Nanaia findet sich auch Šiva, dreiköpfig, halbnackt, Halbmond über der Stirne, in der Rechten Schlinge, die Linke auf dem Dreizack. Legende 𐎧𐎡𐎴 , gleiches Münzzeichen. (Abb. 5)

Diese beiden Rv.-Bilder, die sich unmittelbar aus entsprechenden Darstellungen des Huvishka ableiten lassen, sind anscheinend äusserst selten.⁹ Weitans am häufigsten zeigt die Rückseite Šiva, dreiköpfig, frontal vor dem Stier Nandin, der nach links schaut. Halbmond über dem Scheitel, die üblichen Attribute Schlinge und Dreizack. Legende 𐎧𐎡𐎴 ; Münzzeichen 𐎧𐎡𐎴 . Es ist anzumerken, dass jedesmal, wenn Rv. Šiva und Nandin auftreten, der König auf der Vorderseite einen Dreizack in der Linken hält. (Abb. 6) Dieser Rv.-Typ ist anscheinend sehr stark angeregt von den Rv.-Bildern der Münzen des Vima Kadphises, wo allerdings der Stier nach rechts sieht, der Gott den Dreizack in der Rechten hält und sich mit dem linken Arm auf das Tier lehnt. Dort findet sich auch regelmässig das Symbol *nandipada* links oben im Feld.¹⁰

Das Münzzeichen, das sich auf allen Ausgaben der Kushānas





⁶ Cf. Sten Konow: *Kharoshthi Inscriptions (Corpus Inscr. Indio. vol. II/1. Calcutta 1929)*, p. lxxvii. Für die übrigen Kushān Könige stellt sich die Liste so dar: Kanishka (1) 3-23; Vāsishka 24-28; Huvishka 33-60.



⁷ Für entsprechende Kanishka-Münzen cf. Percy Gardner: *Cat. of Indian Coins, British Museum, Greek and Scythic Kings*, London, 1886, Pl. 26/9.


⁸ Gardner, l. c., p. 159, beschreibt das Objekt als "sceptre ending in the forepart of horse."









⁹ Cf. Gardner, Pl. 28/9-10. Dreiköpfiger Šiva mit vier Armen, *ibid.*, Pl. 28/15-16.

¹⁰ Cf. Gardner, Pl. 25/6-9, 11-14.

findet, hat auf diesen Münzen folgende Formen  - .¹¹ Auf den Münzen mit dem Namen Vāsudeva, die die Vorlagen für die kushāno-sasanidischen Ausgaben geliefert haben, sieht das Münzzeichen so aus:  - . Der Abstand zwischen dem Verbindungstrich der vier Zacken und dem Querstrich ist sehr eng geworden, der Querstrich so breit wie der Verbindungstrich, die senkrechte Linie zwischen beiden ist fortgefallen. Es ist von Wichtigkeit, dass diese Endform schon um 250 n. Chr. da ist, und zwar in jener verdorbenen, barbarischen Ausführung, die auch für Darstellung und Schrift der späten Vāsudeva-Münzen charakteristisch ist.

Nun gibt es eine Anzahl von Münzen, die in vielem den weiter oben beschriebenen Stücken des Vāsudeva ähnlich sind, jedoch ganz deutlich den Namen Kanishka tragen. Sie zeigen Obv. stehenden König nach links, Rechte über Feueraltar, dahinter bebänderter Dreizack; in der Linken Dreizack. Die Beschriftung beginnt hinter dem Kopfe: $\rho\alpha\sigma\eta\alpha\eta\sigma\beta[\alpha\eta]/[\kappa\alpha\eta\eta\beta\kappa\alpha]\kappa\sigma\beta\alpha\eta\sigma$. Rv. Siva mit Nandin, der Gott einköpfig, sonst in der üblichen Art. Münzzeichen , $\sigma\kappa\beta\sigma$.¹² Abwandlungen dieses Typs zeigen Obv. im Feld Brahmi-Lettern, Rv. das Münzzeichen . (Abb. 7) Der Zusammenhang dieser Münzen mit den Münzen jenes Vāsudeva, der der Nachfolger des Huvishka ist, kann nicht geleugnet werden, er wird vor allem durch die besondere Form des Münzzeichens bewiesen.

Der wichtigste Typ der Kanishka-Münzen ist jedoch folgender: Obv. König nach links, im Panzerrock, der links und rechts in Zipfeln endigt, vor Feueraltar, dahinter Dreizack; die Linke hält eine lange Lanze. Rechts in Brahmi "vi"; Inschrift wie oben angeordnet: $\rho\alpha\sigma\eta\alpha\eta\sigma\beta\alpha\sigma\kappa\alpha/\dots\kappa\sigma\kappa\sigma\beta\alpha\eta\sigma$; Rv. Göttin, frontal auf Thron mit hoher Rückenlehne sitzend, in der ausgestreckten Rechten Kranz, im linken Arm Füllhorn; der Thron als dreidimensionales Gebilde wiedergegeben. Rechts $\alpha\rho\alpha\sigma\chi\beta\sigma$ von innen zu lesen, . (Abb. 8) Eine ältere, sehr seltene Formulierung dieses Typs zieht

¹¹ Das Kushān Münzzeichen besteht aus einem unveränderlichen Oberteil, einem Vierzack, der kurz oder lang, breit oder schmal erscheinen kann; die untere Partie dagegen wechselt ständig; so hat Vima Kadphises  - ; (Gardner, Pl. 27/7, 12); Kanishka  -  (*ibid.* Pl. 26/7, 9); Huvishka  (*ibid.* Pl. 27/16),  (Whitehead, Pl. 18/133),  (*ibid.* Pl. 18/117),  (Gardner, Pl. 27/8).

¹² Exemplar in Boston, Museum of Fine Arts; cf. A. Coomaraswamy: *Geschichte der indischen u. indonesischen Kunst*, Leipzig, 1927, fig. 122.

die Göttin auf einer Bank und die Bezeichnung ΑΡΑΧΠΟ links, gleiches Münnzeichen. (Abb. 9)

In den Münzen mit Śiva und Nandin hat Kanishka den gebräuchlichsten Typ des Vāsudeva, des Nachfolgers des Huvishka, beibehalten. Der Gott tritt bei ihm in normaler Gestalt auf, mit einem Kopf und zwei Armen, in einer Form also, die schon unter jenem Vāsudeva die dreiköpfige abgelöst hat. (Abb. 10) Der ganze Habitus dieser Kanishka-Münzen lässt erkennen, dass sie erst nach denen des Vāsudeva, des Nachfolgers Huvishkas, entstanden sein können, aber schon lange vor jenen Münzen, die den Sasaniden als Vorbild gedient haben; dafür spricht auch die Form und die Bedeutung der Schriftzeichen.



Auf die radikale Umstellung der Legende, die rund um den stehenden König läuft, kann nicht genug Nachdruck gelegt werden: man hat da mit dem Schema gebrochen, das seit den Tagen Kanishkas I. unverändert beibehalten worden war. Ferner taucht nun hinter dem Feuertempel ein beiderseitiger Dreizack auf, allem Anschein nach herübergenommen von ähnlichen Formulierungen auf den Münzen des Vima Kadphises.¹³ Entscheidend ist natürlich die Ausbildung des völlig neuen Münztyps mit der thronenden Ardochsho auf der Rückseite; an der Wahl dieser Figur war zweifellos die ungewöhnliche Beliebtheit schuld, deren sich diese Göttin bei den Buddhisten Nordwestindiens erfreute.¹⁴ Dieser Typ wird schliesslich zum Kushān-Typ Nordwestindiens schlechthin, und wird als solcher von allen Nachfolgern der Kushānas übernommen.


Stil der Darstellung, die Form des Münzeichens und der Schriftcharakter sprechen sich strikte dagegen aus, die Kanishka-Gruppe als Ganzes hinter jene Vāsudeva-Gruppe zu setzen, die schliesslich in den kushāno-sasanidischen Ausgaben endigt; es genügt ein Blick auf einen Vertreter der einen und der anderen Gattung, um die Unmöglichkeit einer solchen Anordnung zu demonstrieren. (Abb. 7, 2)

¹³ Cf. Gardner, Pl. 25/11-14.

¹⁴ Der ältere, seltenere Typ mit der Göttin auf der Bank kommt auch in Kupfer vor (Whitehead, Pl. 19/228); der jüngere und für die Numismatik bedeutsamere, der die Göttin auf einem Thron mit Rückenlehne zeigt, ist keine Neuschöpfung im eigentlichen Sinne des Wortes, auch keine Übertragung aus der zeitgenössischen Plastik, sondern von einer Münze des Azes I. (cc. 58-30 v. Chr.) übernommen (*ibid.* Pl. 11/217). Auch da zeigt sich wieder, dass ein Münzbildner sich nach Möglichkeit an schon vorhandene Münzbilder hält.

Nun wird die Situation anscheinend noch weiter verunklärt durch die Tatsache, dass es auch Münzen auf den Namen Vāsudeva gibt, die sich durch die eigentümliche Art der Legendenanordnung eng an die Kanishka-Gruppe anschließen. Die Münzen sehen so aus: Obv. stehender König nach links, Rock mit geradem Saum, vor Feueraltar mit Dreizack, Linke auf hohem Dreizack. Legende beginnt hinter dem Kopf: 𑀧𑁆𑀭𑀸𑀓𑀲𑀺𑀢𑀺𑀣𑀺 / 𑀅𑀸𑀶𑀱𑀺𑀰𑀻𑀫𑀺𑀢𑀾𑀢𑀽 . Rv. Siva mit Nandin, wie üblich, 𑀮𑀺𑀩𑀺 (von aussen) 𑀇𑀸 . (Abb. 11) Eine Variante zeigt: Obv. König wie üblich, aber mit Zipfelrock; Legende wie oben, Brahmi-Lettern im Feld, links: raja; zwischen den Füßen: gho; rechts: rada. Rv. Wie oben. (Abb. 12)

Bevor ich auf diese Vāsudeva-Münzen eingehe, möchte ich an jenen unzweifelhaft spätesten Typ von Vāsudeva-Münzen erinnern der schon am Anfang beschrieben wurde. Im Gegensatz zu jenen Stücken, die auf Grund des Münzzeichens mit Sicherheit dem Nachfolger des Huvishka zugewiesen werden können, findet sich hier ein bebänderter Dreizack hinter dem Feueraltar, und obendrein eine andere Art den Altar darzustellen: statt mit Hilfe von Umrisslinien wird das Gebilde plastisch, also im Relief wiedergegeben. Die Andeutung des Feuers und die Aufnahme des Symbols nandipada erfolgten scheinbar ziemlich spät. Es gibt nur den Typ Śiva und Nandin; das Münzzeichen hat folgende Formen:  - . (Abb. 2, 3.)

Gemeinsam ist den Münzen dieser Gruppe mit denen des selben Typs, die der Nachfolger des Huvishka herausgegeben hat, die Anordnung der Legende und die Abwesenheit von Brahmi-Lettern auf der Vorderseite; des Königs Rock endet stets in einem geraden Saum. Das sind die durchgehend gemeinsamen Züge; gelegentlich wird hier und dort das Münzzeichen  verwendet.

Die Unterschiede bestehen Obv. in der anderen Aufmachung und Darstellungsart des Feueraltars, Rv. in der andern Anordnung des Namens $\alpha\rho\tau\epsilon$: auf der ersten Gruppe sind die Buchstaben zentripetal angeordnet, wie es in solchen Fällen bis dahin üblich war, in der zweiten Gruppe steht das Wort über dem Perlenrand.¹⁵

Wenn man, vorläufig nur als Arbeitshypothese, drei Gruppen von Vāsudeva-Münzen annimmt, wobei Gruppe I die Münzen des Nachfolgers des Huvishka umfasst (Abb. 4-6, 10) und Gruppe III


¹⁵ Gardner, Pl. 29/9 bildet keine Ausnahme: $\sigma\eta\mu\sigma$ ist dort nur von rechts nach links geschrieben.

diejenigen, die den sasanidischen Ausgaben als Vorbild gedient haben (Abb. 2-3), so bleiben als Gruppe II die Münzen, die sich an die Stücke mit dem Namen Kanishka anlehnen (Abb. 11-13); in der Gruppe II macht sich schon die Tendenz zur Schalenform bemerkbar, die in I vollständig fehlt (Abb. 6, 13).

Prüft man nun das Verhältnis der Kanishka-Gruppe zu den Vāsudeva-Gruppen, so zeigt es sich, dass die Kanishka-Münzen eine Art Zwischenstellung zwischen I und II einnehmen. Ein Stück wie das in Boston steht einem Stück der Gruppe I mit demselben Münzzeichen stilistisch sehr nahe, während Ausstattung und Wiedergabe des Altars zur Gruppe II hinüberweisen; auch sieht das $\sigma\kappa\pi\sigma$ der Kanishka-Münzen einmal nach innen, ein ander Mal nach aussen. Die Tatsache, dass Kanishka ausgiebig in Gold und Kupfer münzte, dass er eine ganz neue Anordnung für die Legende der Vorderseite traf und, in der thronenden Ardochsho, einen völlig neuen Münztyp schuf, beweist, dass Kanishka als unabhängiger, selbständiger Herrscher auf Vāsudeva, den Nachfolger des Huvishka, zur Macht kam. Eine Einreihung seiner Münzen zwischen die des Huvishka und des Vāsudeva verbietet sich, wegen des verwendeten Münzzeichens, ebenso wie die Einordnung nach der Gruppe III, die in die kushāno-sasanidischen Stücke übergeht.

Hier helfen die Münzen auf den Namen des Vāsudeva weiter, die sich an den Typ Śiva mit Nandin der Kanishka-Gruppe anschliessen (II). Für sie gilt das Gleiche, was weiter oben für die Kanishka-Münzen gesagt wurde: sie lassen sich nicht vor der Gruppe I und erst recht nicht nach der Gruppe III der Vāsudeva-Münzen unterbringen. Damit ist auch die Frage Original oder Nachahmung in Bezug auf die Kanishka-Münzen beantwortet: wenn der Typ von einem Vāsudeva geschaffen worden wäre, so käme dafür nur der Vāsudeva der Gruppe I in Betracht und das würde wieder einen Vāsudeva II. für die anderen Gruppen postulieren, denn es ist mehr als unwahrscheinlich, dass ein Herrscher seinen eigenen neuen Münztyp einem Rivalen überlässt und sich mit seinen alten Typen weiterbehilft.

So bleibt, als die natürlichste Lösung, Kanishka selbst als der Initiator der Neuerungen, nämlich des Feueraltars mit dem Dreizack dahinter und der Umstellung der Legende. Die Vāsudeva-Münzen, die diesen Kanishka-Ausgaben nahestehen, sind also Nachbildungen. Da nun wieder die Vāsudeva-Gruppe III den Feueraltar genau so bringt wie die Kanishka-Münzen, so wird man auch die

Gruppe III als von den Kanishka-Münzen abhängig ansprechen müssen. Aus dem Vorkommen des Münzzeichens  auf den Münzen der Gruppe I (Vāsudeva), des Kanishka und der Gruppe II (Vāsudeva) lässt sich schliessen, dass diese Wandlungen sich in verhältnismässig kurzer Zeit abgespielt haben. Schliesslich sei noch einmal festgestellt, dass der Haupttyp Kanishkas nicht der mit Siva und Nandin, sondern der mit der thronenden Ardochsho ist; dass ferner nach den Fundberichten der Typ Siva und Nandin, gleichviel welchen Herrschers, im Kabultal, der der Ardochsho weiter im Osten überwog;¹⁶ dass endlich keine Münze mit der Ardochsho bekannt ist, die den Namen Vāsudeva trägt.

Sucht man nach dem Sinn dieser verwirrenden Fülle von Erscheinungen, von Ähnlichkeiten und Unterschieden, so sagt man nichts Neues, wenn man sie als den Niederschlag besonders turbulenter Zeiten interpretiert. Viel schwieriger ist es schon, das Verhältnis der einzelnen Gruppen zu einander auszumachen und, wenigstens versuchsweise, an Hand der Münzen die Geschichte der Späten Kushānas zu rekonstruieren. Wenn ich das, eben nur versuchsweise, unternehme, so will ich ausdrücklich bemerken, dass ich mir des hypothetischen Charakters wohl bewusst bin; doch scheint es mir wichtig, die Frage aufzunehmen und zur Diskussion zu stellen.

Auf festem historischen Boden befindet man sich bei Vāsudeva, dem Nachfolger des Huvishka, der durch Steininschriften aus den Jahren 74-98 der Kanishka-Ära als Herrscher über Nordwestindien bezeugt ist. Seine Münzen schliessen sich in einigen Rv.-Darstellungen eng an die seines Vorgängers an, ebenso lässt sich sein Münzzeichen ohne weiteres als vom Münzzeichen Huvishkas herkommend verstehen. Es ist anzunehmen, dass Vāsudevas Reich nicht nur Nord- und Nordwestindien umfasste, sondern auch das Kernland der Kushānas, das alte Baktrien. Auf diesen Vāsudeva folgte ein Herrscher namens Kanishka, den man, da der gleich-

¹⁶ A. Cunningham: "Later Indo-Scythians," *Numismatic Chronicle*, 1893, p. 115: "The former type prevailed in the Kabul valley and was adopted by the Sassanian kings for their Bactrian coins; the latter type prevailed in the East where it was adopted by the Gupta kings in the middle of the fourth century A. D. and eventually it formed the lasting types of the Kashmir coinage down to the Muhammadan conquest in the fourteenth century." P. 116 spricht C. nochmals davon, dass die Münzen mit dem Bild der Glücksgöttin in Nordwestindien besonders häufig seien, während die Siva-Typen aus dem Westen kämen.

namige Fürst der Ara-Inschrift schon als Kanishka II. in die Geschichte eingeführt worden ist, Kanishka III. wird nennen müssen. Mit ihm kamen einige sehr wichtige Neuerungen auf, die Umstellung der Beschriftung, eine andere Art von Feueraltar, und schliesslich ein ganz neuer Münztyp, der mit der thronenden Ardochsho. Kanishka III. hat jedoch auch Münzen vom Typ Siva mit Nandin herausgegeben, anscheinend vor den Ardochsho-Stücken; es ist nicht beweisbar, dass damals schon, wie es später sicher der Fall war, der Typ Siva mit Nandin der für die Gebiete nördlich des Hindukush bezeichnende Münztyp war; wie dem auch sei, unbestreitbar war Kanishka III. der Nachfolger Vāsudevas in der Herrschaft über Nordwestindien, und die Münzen vom Ardochsho-Typ blieben auf dieses Gebiet beschränkt.

Unter Kanishka III. scheint das grosse Kushān Reich geteilt worden zu sein, und zwar hat allen Anzeichen nach ein Vāsudeva die nördliche Hälfte erhalten; dieser Vāsudeva II. ahmt zuerst den Münztyp Siva mit Nandin des Kanishka nach, aber schon nach kurzer Zeit dürfte er dazu übergegangen sein, den gleichen Münztyp seines grossen Namensvetters, des Vāsudeva I., nachzubilden, wobei er allerdings die unter Kanishka III. aufgekommene Form des Feueraltars und die Anordnung der Legende auf der Rückseite beibehielt. Die Verwendung von Brahmi-Lettern, die sich für Kanishka III. als notwendig herausgestellt hatte, weil offenbar die graeco-kushānische Schrift in Nordwestindien nicht mehr im gleichen Masse verstanden wurde wie in Baktrien, unterbleibt bezeichnenderweise auf diesen, nur für Baktrien bestimmten Ausgaben des Vāsudeva II. Die Verwendung des gleichen Münzzeichens auf den Münzen des Vāsudeva I., des Kanishka III. und des Vāsudeva II. lässt darauf schliessen, dass diese politischen Entwicklungen sich ziemlich rasch vollzogen.

Es wird sich schwerlich etwas dagegen vorbringen lassen, wenn man diesen Vāsudeva II. mit dem P'ō-tiao 波調, König der Grossen Kushānas, identifiziert, der nach dem San-kuo chih 三國志 anfangs 230 n. Chr. eine Gesandtschaft an den chinesischen Hof geschickt hatte;¹⁷ sicher ist er jener Herrscher, der sein Land zwischen 230-240 n. Chr. an Ardashir I. verlor.

¹⁷ San-kuo chih, Abschnitt Wei chih 魏志, Kap. 3, p. 3 r. (cf. Chavannes, *T'oung Pao*, 1904, p. 489; E. H. Parker, *China and Religion* (London, 1905), 76.

Kanishka III. begnügte sich, freiwillig oder gezwungen, mit der Herrschaft über die Gebiete südlich des Hindukush, wobei es offen bleibt, ob das Kabultal ihm oder dem Vāsudeva II. unterstand. Jedenfalls wird nun der Ardochsho-Typ für Kanishka III. und Nordwestindien ebenso charakteristisch wie der Siva-Nandin-Typ für Vāsudeva II. und Baktrien.

Über die Dauer seiner Herrschaft lässt sich vorläufig nichts sagen; sein Reich zerfiel schliesslich in eine Reihe kleiner Fürstentümer, deren Herrscher den von ihm geschaffenen Münztyp beibehielten, mit sinnlos und unlesbar gewordener graeco-kushānischer Legende und zunehmender Häufung von Brahmi-Lettern. Diese Fürsten gehörten verschiedenen Stämmen an, einer nannte sich Śaka, ein anderer Kushān. Die Münzen dieser kleinen Fürsten wurden dann von Samudragupta (335-380) nachgebildet.

Das Gedächtnis Kanishkas III. wird nicht nur durch seine Münzen und deren Nachbildungen bewahrt; jene Stelle in Kalhanas *Rājataranginī* (I, 168 ff.) "In diesem Land (d. i. Kashmir) gab es drei Könige, Hushka, Jushka und Kanishka, die drei Städte bauten, welche nach ihnen genannt wurden", die immer Kopfzerbrechen verursacht hatte, weil man dabei an Kanishka I. gedacht hatte und sich nicht erklären konnte, warum die Reihenfolge der Herrscher auf den Kopf gestellt war, wird sofort sinnvoll, wenn man den Kanishka mit dem Kanishka III. gleichsetzt, dessen Münzen, wie Cunningham ganz richtig bemerkt hat, tatsächlich bis ins xiv. Jahrhundert für Kashmir vorbildlich geblieben sind.¹⁸

¹⁸ Cf. Sten Konow: *Karoshthī Inscr.*, pp. lxxix f.

RAS SHAMRA NOTES VI: THE DANIEL TEXT

JAMES A. MONTGOMERY
UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

WITH two volumes of this year's date M. Virolleaud initiates a "definitive publication" of the Ras Shamra documents. In his series, entitled *Mission de Ras Shamra*, the editor announces that he will have the cooperation of MM. Dhorme, Dussaud, Thureau-Dangin. The series starts with the publication of two new texts: in Vol. I, *La légende phénicienne de Danel*, in Vol. II, *La légende de Keret, roi des Sidoniens*, tantalizing excerpts from both of which texts he has already presented to his readers. Also Vol. I is prefaced with an admirable introduction of 123 pages bearing upon the finds, their discovery and decipherment, and drawing a picture of the civilization of Ras Shamra. The present writer would express for himself his gratitude for these fresh contributions and for the infinitely patient study that M. Virolleaud has devoted to the presentation of the new material. The present article offers some sporadic notes on the Danel text, on certain points where the writer finds interpretations varying from those of the editor. The full glossary-concordance at the end of the volume renders reference to all words and passages most convenient, and saves the student much trouble.

The myths involved in the text are very perplexing. I venture one cross-reference which may be of interest. Text I is largely devoted to the theme of "breaking the wings of the eagles," e. g. line 114, *knp nšrm b'l yṭbr*. This recalls the Akkadian myth of Adapa, in which the hero breaks the wing of the South Wind, e. g. tablet 2, l. 5, *kappaki lu-ušebir* (see Rogers, *Cuneiform Parallels*, 67 ff., with full bibliography). The result of this outrage on the South Wind was that the cool breeze of the sea no longer tempered the heat of the land. Now at the beginning of Text I occur passages expressive of drought, ll. 31 ff. (see further below), and the theme is followed by that of the sending of clouds, rain, dew, ll. 40 ff. And just as for his sin Adapa finally lost immortality, so there is a similar theme of Aqhat's mortality in the present text, II, vi (see below).

To the writer's mind the most interesting linguistic point established by this text is the demonstration of the archaic pronouns,

hwt (= Akk. *šwātu*), *hyt* (= Akk. *švāti*), *hmt* (= Phoen. *hmt*), "he, she, they." He had earlier recognized pronominal *hwt* in the previous texts (see this JOURNAL 34 (1934). 63); this was repeated in Montgomery and Harris, *Ras Shamra Mythological Texts*, 19, 96, but otherwise only accepted by Speiser in his *Studies of Sem. Preformatives*, p. 27 above, n. 17. The case was complicated by the appearance of another vocable *hwt*, doubtless meaning "word." Vir. adhering strictly to this latter sense has regarded the parallel vocable *hyt*, *hmt* as variations of *hwt*, and translated them all equally with "le Verbe" (cf. his remarks p. 159). But to cite typical occurrences: I, 129, 132, *hwt* refers to the masc. antecedent "Hargab father of eagles"; II, 138, 143 *hyt* refers to "Semel mother of eagles"; and at II, 115, 119, 150 *hmt* refers to the plural "eagles." In these cases the pronoun is in the genitive after the noun *diy* (see below). But *hwt* also appears as objective pronoun preceding the verb, e. g. I 15 f., *hwt l aḥw*, "him will I keep alive," and so with change of person of verb at III i 13; and similarly *hmt*, II v 30, *tkbd hmt*, "thou shalt honor them."

The vocable *qšt* is a constant theme in II, appearing also in I and III. Vir. translates with "chalice," and assumes some kind of magical bowl (p. 117). But apart from proximity to unintelligible *kḏ* (Vir. as "cruche") at I, 14, I find nothing to support this interpretation. I have no doubt that it has the obvious sense of "bow," as in Heb. What the customary parallel *qšt* means, I do not know. From the root meaning "to strip" I might propose that the word means the leather "strip" which made the cord of the bow. I adduce the following proofs for identification of *qšt*. In II, v the artisan doublet Ktr-Ḥasis is charged by Danel with some commission concerning "my *qšt*" (l. 12). At II, 35 f. occurs a slightly mutilated phrase which I would read as *qšt yqb* [*yḏrk l aqht* (most of which appears in Vir.'s translation as blank), i. e. "the bow he curves, he shoots at Aqhat"; cf. Biblical *dārak qāšet* and the Aram. root *qbb*. Then *plk qšty* at l. 16 means "the curve of my bow" (*plk* has occurred in earlier texts as "spindle"). At vi 13 occurs the fragment *tšb qšt*, "shalt set up the bow"; the preceding line contains the fragment *thmtm brq*, "abysses, lightning," which collocation recalls the Biblical "I will set my bow in the clouds."

Danel's name in II i is generally followed with *usr*. Vir. (pp. 90, 190) relates the word to root *ʾsr*, "to gird"; but in the first

reference he proposes for the sequence *uzr ilm*, "he who girds the gods," in the second he compares Heb. *'āzūr*, "girded," while in his translations he only transliterates the vocable, obtaining, I believe, false combinations. N.B. the recurrent phrase at II. 7 ff., 9 ff., 22 ff. Here, briefly speaking, Vir. translates "Danel the *uzr* of the gods will eat (*ylhm*), the *uzr* of the gods will drink (*yšqy*), the sons of holiness." But root *šqy* means "to give to drink"; translate then, "D. *uzr* the gods feeds, *uzr* gives to drink the sons of holiness." That is, the epithet alternates with the name. I am inclined to take *uzr* as Pual pass. ppl. with *m*-preformative lost as in certain cases in Heb.; see GK § 52, 5, and Bergsträsser, *HG* p. 95, who however denies the validity of all the alleged cases. At II, vi, 35 occurs in obscure context *mmuzryt*, in which a Pual fem. ppl. may be detected. Danel is then "the girded one"; cf. the Phoenician (Citium) epithet for Ashtart, *'um ha-'zrt* (which Vir. notes), probably "the girded mother." For the root in Phoenician see Glossary in Harris, *Grammar of the Phoen. Language* (1936).

In I and II a number of remarkable epithets are added to Danel's name, some of them of apparently metaphysical character. These are collated by Vir., pp. 87 ff.; for some terms appearing earlier cf. Dussaud, *RHR* 1935, 37 ff. I note the element *mt*, e. g. in the phrase *mt rpi mt hrnmy*. Vir. interprets it from the root "to die." But Danel is not represented as a mortal character. I must think of the element as meaning "man" (cf. Heb., Eth.). Danel is also *il xzr* (the same phrase earlier—the second word is apparently a place-name, see below), and so he would be both human and divine, a demi-god.

For *il xzr* remarkable variants occur: at I, 48 *all xzr*, at I. 37 *al xzr*. These variants cannot be due to confusion of the dissimilar alephs. I agree with Vir. that *al* is error for *all*. Evidently this vocable is a variant of *il*. Comparison may be made with generally diminutive forms in Semitic formed by duplication of the second radical; see Brockelmann, *Grundriss*, I, § 172, e. g. Syr. *tellālā*, "hillock." The variations of the theme *il* are of interest. Besides ancient *'lāh*, at Ras Shamra as well as Biblical, we have S. Arab. pl. *'līt*, and also Heb. *'ēlil*, "false god," which can best be explained as a disparaging diminutive = *'ulail*. Also in these texts appears the pl. *ilnm* = Phoen., in which *-n* may be diminutive; cf. the writer's note on the name Solomon, *JQR* 25 (1936). 263. Further

this pl. form appears in the extension *ilnym* (IV, i, 2), corroborating the same form in an earlier text (A sup. vi, 46). The form is evidently gentilic to *il*, and varies with it as do "divi" and "dei" in Latin.

A frequent parallel to *nšr*, "eagle," is *diy*, e. g. III, i, 17 f., *km nšr km diy*, "as eagle so *d*." Vir. sagaciously identifies the word with Heb. *de'ā(h)*, a species of bird of prey. But this meaning is not always applicable; e. g. I, 114, "the wings of the eagle Baal breaks; Baal breaks their *diy* (*diyhm*)," i. e. the word here refers to some part of the bird's anatomy. I had independently identified it with Arab. *da'y*, with general meaning of the "ribs," and so of the breast-bone of a bird; Freytag, *Lex.*, s. v., notes the Arabic name for the crow, *ibn da'yat*, so called because he plucks his breast. Such a meaning is desiderated in the passage cited. G. E. Post, s. v. "Eagles" in Hastings' *DB*, notes as the most abundant of the eagle-tribe in Palestine the "short-toed eagle," with "brightly spotted breasts."

The following are current notes on the text and translation.

I, 14 ff. "I will strike him *kd* (=so?) upon his bow, I will strike him upon his *qš't*; him I shall surely keep alive, his bow shalt thou give me." As noted above, Vir. has an entirely different interpretation of *qš't*, here = "bow." The third clause reads *hwt l aḥw*, which Vir. renders with "révéler le Verbe," i. e. the verb as from the root "to show." But I understand the root as it appears in Phoen. *ḥwy* = Heb. *ḥyy*, "to live." The same phrase with modulation of the verb occurs at III, i, 13, *hwt lt(ḥw)*; and at II, vi, 32 *aḥwy aqht* would accordingly mean "I will keep alive (or, revive) Aqhat."

I, 25-28, almost wholly blank. As against Vir. I would supply in ll. 27 f. [*yḏ't*] *hl[k kbkbm]*, so introducing the genius Pxt; see at I, 50 ff.

I, 30-31. *bgrn yḥrp—yḥsp iḥ*; translate, "in the threshing floor he makes drought—strips the blossom" (the latter = Heb. *'ēb*).

I, 33. Strangely Vir. translates *ḥbl digm* with "le vol des éperviers," understanding the passage as of bird augury, although he identifies the word with the same in Heb., "troop" at I Sa. 10: 5, 10. Translate, "the flock of vultures."

I, 50 ff. The genius Pxt is given a frequently recurrent string of titles. The third phrase is *ḥlmt drk kbkbm*, "knower of the way(s) of the stars," as with Vir.; the first *ḥlmt my* (or *mym*—

both forms appear), the verb in which I would translate after Arab. *takima* as "dweller of the waters" (such a meaning would better explain the Heb. place-name Shechem than traditional "shoulder"). The intervening phrase *ḥspt lš'r ṭl* is of similar syntax, each phrase being introduced with a fem. ppl., although the only obvious identification in this phrase is that of *ṭl*, "dew." Vir. renders the epithets thus: "qui portes sur tes épaules l'eau de la ḥspt, sur l'orge (,) répands la rosée, toi qui connais la marche des étoiles."

I, 105 ff. Vir. discovers a fresh *persona dramatis* in one "yahid," based on *yhd* l. 135. But this is a verbal form, varying with the first person *aḥd*; cf. *waḥd* l. 125, varying with *wyhd* l. 144, each being followed by an identical phrase.

I, 118. *knṗ nšrm ybn b'l*. Vir. translates, "Baal has created the wing of the eagles." But I would take the root as *byn*, in its original physical sense of separating, cleaving (so in Syr.), and the phrase is then parallel to the frequent *mḥš knṗ*, "smite the wing."

I, 152. *qr mym*, cf. 190 f. *mym qr* [*y*]m. *qr* must certainly mean "source, well"; I had already identified the word in Vir.'s text, "Les chasses de Ba'al," see above, p. 227.

I, 157. *yłk mrrt*; 165 *yłk qrt ablm*. *yłk* can hardly be verbal, but = *ya-laki*, "Ah to thee," in each case being followed by several nouns with second-personal suffix *-k*.

I, 173, 184. *pzxm xr*. Vir. does not interpret, proposes a plural in the first word. The phrase, occurring 1° after "in his palace—in his courts," 2° after "in my palace," etc., is evidently a place-name. The second word is then a determinative, = "mountain"? See Glossary in *R. S. Myth. T.*, 130, and the writer's note in this JOURNAL, 53. 122.

I, 208 f. *itt—šbi nrt ilm špš—r—*. Vir. suggests supplying *trḥ* in the first lacuna, *krt* in the second, obtaining "la femme de Terah. (O) soldat du Soleil, le Flambeau des dieux, Keret!" But we have here current epithets of the sun-goddess. The first lacuna is to be filled out from Tablet 3: 53 with *młk*, the second with *šḥrrt* (as e. g. at A, ii, 24), with the resultant, "the wife of the king of the Host, the burning Flame of the gods, the Sun."

II, 1, 5 f. *yškb yd—*. Fill out from l. 15, *yškb—m*, i. e. read *ydm* in both places, and translate, "he lies down, he sleeps" (root *dmm* or *dūm*). The following vocable in the first case, *pynl* is to be corrected from l. 16, *pyln*, "and he lodges" (there seven days etc.).

II, i, 31 (cf. ii 5 f., 19 f.). *ihd ydh bšlern m'mšh*. The last two words Vir. translates, "dans l'ivresse qui l'appesantit." But the first word is to be identified with the Heb. root *škr*, "to reward," with noun *šākār*, with the resultant "he will hold his hand in reward of his labors"; cf. l. 35, "II holds his servant, blesses Danel."

II, v, 25. I translate, "Comes Ktr-and-Hss, in the hands of Danel gives the bow, at his knees (*lbrkh*) prepares (*y'db*) the qst." Vir. translates *lbrkh* with "pour le bénir."

II, vi, 25 ff. Anat speaks. Her opening words may be translated, in general with Vir., "the desire of life is Aqhat's, the desire of life." Then *atnk blmt*; this I render with "I will render thee immortal," i. e. *blmt* as Heb. *bēlî mêt*, cf. *bēlî šēm*, "nameless," Job 30: 8. There follows the theme of immortality: "I will make thee count the years with Baal," etc. Then follows *kyhwy y'sr hwy* = (?) "for he revives, enriches (?) the living (?)" ; see note on *hwy* above. At l. 38 Aqhat expresses his mortality. The phrase *an mtm amt* can best be translated, "I must die," *mtm* being abs. inf. plus *ma*; cf. Gen. 2: 17.

II, vi, 43 f. *pš* is paralleled with *g'n*. Vir. holds that the meaning "sin" for *pš* does not accord with the second word, which he translates "glory," i. e. Heb. *gā'ôn*. But the latter word may be translated with the Biblical sense of "presumption" and so parallel "sin." The broken passage may refer to the presumptuous act of Aqhat's which induced his tragedy and death.

IV, ii, 2. *'dd il* = "Adad the god"? Cf. *hđ*, "Haddu," in earlier texts.

TURKIC MATERIAL IN HUNGARIAN

JOHN DYNELEY PRINCE
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

THE STUDY of Turko-Tartar material in Hungarian (Magyar) involves many more difficulties than for example were encountered in my recent examination of Slavonic loan-words in common use in Magyar.¹ In the latter instance, the foreign material consists manifestly of real loan-words, mostly adopted for cultural reasons and altered phonetically according to the genius of the Magyar language, which has much similar loan-word material from German and Latin.

Regarding the Turkic elements in Magyar the case is somewhat different, for here the investigator must consider how many of the so-called borrowed words and elements are really the result of conscious acquisition and how many are actual cognates between proto-Magyar and Turkic. It is fairly obvious, for example, that such a parallel as the following phrase is not "loan material": Tk. *Čök*² *var* = M. *sok van* "there are many" (there is much). The cognate character of Tk. *var*-M. *van* seems obvious. Furthermore, the relationship between Tk. *ol* "to be" and M. *v-ol-t* (volt), "was" is of the same cognate character. Cf. also M. *oly*, *olyan*-Tk. *öyle*, "thus, so," M. *jó*-Tk. *eyü* (*eyi*, *iyi*) "good"; M. and Tk. *öl*, respectively, "kill and die" etc. (see also Glossary below.) The M. verbal suffixes 1p. *-m*; 2p. *-sz*-Tk. *-m*, *s(en)* clearly point to a primitive, common, cognate linguistic connection. Such fundamentals are practically never borrowed. The case is the same in both languages with the personal pronouns from which the verbal suffixes are in general divided: M. *én* "I" (**e-men*, with elision of *-m-* (see below *sub kan-kaman-kaban*)-Tk. *men* (Osmali *ben*); Tk. *sen* "thou" (also *s* in Finnic, as Suomi *-sinä*)-M. *te*, where *s* = *t-* etc. Further examples will be found in Szinnyey.³ Note especially

¹ "Slavonic Loan Material in Hungarian," *Proc. Amer. Philosophical Soc.* Vol. 75 (1935), pp. 691-603.

² M. = Magyar; Tk. = Turkic. The Magyar phonetics are as follows: *á* = a in "father"; *a* = o in "not"; *é* = a in "fate"; *e* = a in "hat"; *í* = i in "machine"; *i* = i in "pin"; *ó* = o in "note"; *o* = short aw; *ú* = oo in "fool"; *u* = oo in "foot"; *c* = ts; *cs* = ch; *s* = sh; *sz* = s; *z* = z in "zeal."

³ Joseph Szinnyei, *Finnish-Ugrische Sprachwissenschaft*, Leipzig, 1910.

the dental (*d*) denoting past relation, as Tk. *öldü* "he died"—M. *ölte* "he killed"; Tk. *oldu* "he became"—M. *volt* "he was" etc. These morphological resemblances are very obvious and have been noticed since the inception of Finno-Ugric philological science. There are also a number of striking similarities, both morphological and semantic, between Finno-Ugric and apparently proto-Iranian.⁴

The origin of the Magyars as a distinct linguistic group is difficult to determine with exactness. It is however possible to make certain interesting deductions, at least, as to their westward route and Asiatic contacts.

It should be noticed first that of the present Finno-Ugric groups, there are only three Ugric speaking peoples in existence today; viz, in Siberia, the Ostiaks (Tobolsk) and the Voguls⁵ (Perm and Tobolsk) and in Europe the Magyars in contradistinction to the great number of Finnic tribes, of which the most important is the Suomi of modern Finland.

The proto-Ugors are referred to in Chinese Annals as direct neighbors of the fur trappers known as Ting-Ting = Tunguz, a modern Finnic tribe. Another branch of clearly the same stock, described as Ogurs, are believed to have been descendants of the western branch of the ancient Altai (Turkic) group. We find Saragurs and Onugurs living together under the rule of the Hun Empire from the first to the fifth Christian centuries and from the fifth to the sixth centuries A. D. under the Hun-Bulgarian Empire.

The name *Onugur* appears later as *Ungar* and is clearly the same word, the intercalated *-u-* in *Onugur* certifying to the hard pronunciation of the *-g-* as in later "*Hungar(ia)*." The traditional German pronunciation of *Ungarn* is also with the hard *-g-*. The name is often incorrectly pronounced *Ungarn* with *-ng-* as in "sing-ing." The word Magyar is very puzzling and at present impossible to derive accurately. The soft *-gy-* (*-dj*) is the chief stumbling block, because if one could associate Magyar with *magar*, *mogur-mogul*, the way would seem clear to its connection with *mogul-mongol*. Unfortunately the change of *-g-* to *-gy-* seems to be phonetically impossible, as even if we suppose that **magar* could have become *maghar*, a plausible suggestion, the softening of the guttural *-gh-* into *-gy-* (*-dj*) would still appear impossible. Nor may

⁴ Cf. Prince, *op. cit.*, pp. 592-3.

⁵ The so-called Ob-Ugor from the river Ob.

we consider *magyar* to be an inversion of *Ugur*, *Ungur* (cf. above), also for phonetic reasons.

The fact that the early Magyars themselves derive their name from the legendary *Ahnherr Magyar*, who with an equally legendary Hunnar, were the reputed ancestors of the Magyars and Huns, seems to show that the meaning and connection of *Magyar* were unknown to them. One may compare the imaginary *Ahnherren Czech* and *Lech* respectively for the Czechs and Poles. This was the ancient method of explaining unknown tribal names.

From 568-615 A. D. the Asiatic Hungarians constituted part of the Asiatic Turkish Empire. For half a century after 615 A. D. the two peoples were again in close contact as an integral part of the Onugur-Bulgarian Empire. The ancestors of the Hungarians came into contact with the ancient Turks through different political connections. For about two centuries after 615 the Ongurs (Ungurs) belonged to the Kazar Empire (the Kazars were descendants of the Western Turks). These Ongurs are the ancestors of the Hétmagyar, Hetmogur, or Seven Magyars, whose descendants were the Magyars who migrated into the Danube Valley. These political connections made possible the mixing and intermingling of the Turkish and Hungarian groups. We have positive proofs that these connections were not only those of neighbors, but that they lived together for a long time. This explains the loan-words from the Turkish language, the Turks possessing a higher culture than the Magyars. The folk customs of the first settlers, the system of organizations for purposes of war, and many personal names, were all definitely Turkish. Moreover the Arabian and Byzantine authors of the 9th century called the Hungarians Turks. It is therefore quite obvious that there was definite intermixing of the two peoples.

The general conclusion must be that the hordes which subsequently became the proto-Magyars were of mixed Hun origin, as were indeed the proto-Turkish tribes themselves. The word *Hun* seems to have appeared in the Chinese Han period about 400 B. C. in the form *Hung-nu*, a probability to which my attention was called by my late colleague, Dr. Friedrich Hirth, formerly Professor of Chinese at Columbia University. The same element (*h*)ung is evidently present in the above cited tribal names *Unugur*, *Ungur*, etc.

It is possible that all these forms are combinations and inversions of *Hung-ur* "the Hun lords." In modern M. *ur* = "master, lord,

Sir" and may be considered to be in the earlier idiom a root denoting dominion.

The Finno-Ugric-Turkic groups of languages probably separated from one another at a date before the morphology was well established, so that each branch developed its grammatical forms, subsequent to the primitive division. We have only to notice the form variation in the three language groups, to be convinced of this. In the present brief paper I have sought only to interest American and English philologists in the study of the complicated problem of Magyar origins, a subject which has attracted too little attention in both countries, which have never produced a Vambéry, Szinnyei, or Vilhelm Thomsen. With this object in view a short glossary of specimen Magyar-Turkic comparisons follows herewith, consisting exclusively of M. words believed to antedate the Magyar occupation of Hungary by the Árpád hordes in 896 A. D. In the glossary much of the material, which I have drawn from Radloff, Munkácsi and Gombocz,⁶ is supplemented by brief commentaries on the respective cognate or loan character of the roots.

GLOSSARY OF COMPARISONS

ács (acc. *ácsot*) "carpenter, artisan." In Old Magyar *ács*. Clearly a Turkic loan-word, probably of the pre-Osmanli period from *aghđji* "a wood worker," from the general Turkic *agadj* "treewood." Cf. *Tohagatai jaghađ*; also in Kirghiz etc. In other Tartar-Turkic *-akhas*, *akhaś* "wood tree." The older M *alos* with *-l-* replacing an omitted sound in this case the guttural *-gh-* (*kħ*) seems to have a parallel in M *boldog* "happy," *böles* "prudent," where the *-l-* seems facetitious, as these words are associated respectively with *böđ-ult* "crazy, insanely gay"; and *böcs* from *bö* "wide" (*böcs*—really broad viewed). This is confirmed by the M. dialectic pronunciations of *boldog*, *böcs* as *böđog*, *bös*.

agar or *agár* "greyhound"; Baraka *igār*; Kirg. Kuman, *eger* "hunting dog." Note the vowel change between M. *agar*, Baraka *igār*, and Kirghiz *eger*. The word *agar* probably occurs in the M. place-names *Agárd*, *Agáros*, J. Szinnyei, *Tajazotár* (Dialect Dictionary), Budapest, 1889.

alma "apple" occurs in all Turkic idioms, in some of which occurs the apparent variant *amlá* "sour," the usual M. word for which is *savanyu*. This may not be a loan word in M. but a cognate. On the other hand the common Turkic *alma* may be an early loan word in all the idioms, from an unknown original. It would be necessary to study primitive apple culture to discuss this common word intelligently.

arpa "barley"; occurs in n. p. r. *Árpád* and also *Árpád*, a place-name

⁶ Gombocz Zoltan, "Honfoglalás előtti Török jóvevénysszavaink" ("Our Turkish Loanwords before the Occupation"), in the *Publications of the Hungarian Philological Society*, Budapest, 1908.

(cf. also *Árpás*); Osm. Tchag. Kirg. Kazan. *arpa* (in Croatian occurs as a loanword *arpakaš* "barley" and probably *arpao* "oleander"). Chuwash *urba, orba*; Mong. Kalmyk *arbai*; Mong. *arfát*; Mandju *arfa* "sort of grain." The same doubt as to the borrowed character of this word in M. seems to present itself as in the case of *alma*. *arpa* and *alma* may be cognates of earlier Turkic stems. Note the *b-f* interchange in the above comparisons.

bajusz "moustache"; Osm. *bifük*; Azar-baijan *bik*; Kazan *mājāk*; Chuwash *majakh*; Yakut *bitik*. For the interchange *b-m* note Osm. *ben-Sart men*.

balta "axe, hatchet"; Osm. *balta*; Tchag. *baltak, balto, baltu*; Uigur *baltu*; Kazan *balta*; Bashkir *bálta*; Teleuti kuman *palta*; Kojbal *palti*; Yakut and Mongol *balta*. This like *alma* and *árpád* seems to be common Ugro-Turkic property.

béka "frog"; Osm. *baga*—general name for all batrachians or for tortoise or tortoiseshell. Note Tchag. *baka*; Kun. *baga*; Kazan *baka*; Bashkir *baka*; Kolbel *pagha*; Karagöz *paga*; Altai *paka*; Kondomski *pagan*; Urjanchai *pa'a*; Yakut *paya*; Buriat *baka, bakha*; Mandju *valšan*; note that Osm. *körbagha*—"tortoise"—M. *teknösbéka*. Common property again and probably cognate. The change M. -*e*- from -*a*- in the other dialects is interesting.

béke "peace"; Tchagatai *bekik*; *bikik* "bound, shut, closed"; *aralari bikik dur*, "they live in peace" (Vambéry, *Studien*, 1867, p. 252), *bikik* "bound, fastened"; cf. Tchag. *bikitnek, bekitmek* "bind, make peace"; Tchag. *bik, bek*, "firm, tight"; Uigur *bik, bekin*, "firm"; Osm. *pek* used also for "very"; Kazan *bik*, this seems a strange equation, as to *bekik*. The corresponding form to M. *béke* would be *bökö* and not *beki*, as M. -*é*- is a vocalic change from earlier -*ö*-. Cf. the vulgar German pronunciation *schön* for *schön*.

hír (*hēr*) "noise, cry, renown, hearsay." *hirtelen, hértelen, hertelen, hértelen, hértelen* "unforeseen, suddenly, quick"; cf. Osm. Tchag. *khaber* "news, message, rumor"; Tarançi *khübär*; Kazan *kabär*; Baraba *käbar*; Kirg. *kabar*; Bashkir *khübär*; Chuwash *khibar* (all from Arabic *khabar* "news, account, etc." The above parallels are open to doubt, as the Arabic-Turkish -*h*- is not subject to elision. It seems at least equally probably that M. *hír*, which occurs also as a M. loanword in Croatian in the sense "whim, caprice" may be a German loanword from *Hören* "hearing."

int "direction"; cf. *intēs* "being directed towards"; *intēs* "think, intend, hint"; Uigur *ökhdī, ökhdi* "plumbline" (Munkacsı, *Nyelvtudományi közlemények*, 32, 394) but *khd* = *nt* seems a doubtful comparison. See second *int*. below.

int "beckon, indicate, warn"; *inseleg, inscelkedik* (**int-seleg*) "attempt, be sneaky"; Uigur, Tanançi, Tchagatai, Karaim *indä*; Kirghiz *inda*; Teleuti Tartar *inde*; Kazan, Tobolski Uigur *imla*; Baraba *imna* "make a sign with the hand, beckon, summon, invite" (Radloff, *Türk-Sprachmaterial* I. 1407; VIII. 1447); Mong. *imne* "blink the eyes and nod the head in consent." In Kirg. Baraba, Tobolski, Kazan the root is *im*; Altai Teleuti *im* "a sign with the hand or a distinguishing cut on a domestic animal's ear" (Radloff I. 1403, 1571). The equation Tk. *nd*-M. *nt*

is not always correct, according to Budenz. There is an interrelation between Finn-Ugric *m-l*, before *ir*.

ir "write"; Osm., Krim Tatar, Kazan *jaz* (Radloff, *Wörterb. d. Türk-dialekte* III. 226) a brilliant comparison. Cf. Bashkir *jagh*-Kirk. *ir* "write, draw"; Chuwash *śir*; Mong. *iru* "draw, calculate"; *iruk* "draw a picture." The changes are interesting, first we observe for M *ir*, a consonantal prefix *j* (*y*) = *s* and even the guttural *c*; and secondly the not uncommon *r-j* mutation. Here again one must stress the cognate character of M. *ir* with the Turkic stems.

kan "male, male organ"; Tchagatai, Kazan, Kirghiz, Bashkir *kaban*; Altai *kaman*, *kaban* "wild boar"; Mong. *khabar* (Munkacsi, *Ethnologie* IV. 205). The unparalleled disappearance of *-b-* would seem to be incomprehensible, but an internal *m-w* frequently lapses in other languages. Note however that *b-m* interchange *kama-kaba*. This phenomenon occurs in ancient Sumerian. It is even possible that M. *hamu* "ashes" may in such a fashion be a cognate of Japanese *hai* "ashes," for example in *haibon* "ashtray."

kava (*gáva*, *kámva*, *kanva*, *kányva*) "ring or hoop"; Tobolski *kabak* "fence"; Kirk. *kabak*, *sajvin kabagi* "upper arch or bend of a ravine"; Osm. *kapa* "envelopment" (surrounding); Tchagatai *kaba* "setting, enclosure, siege"; Kirk. *kama*. Note that M. *v* here interchanges with K. *b* and *m*, and cf. *kan*, just alone possibly from a *-b-* form *kaban*, *kaman*.

oroslan "lion"; Uigur, Osm., Tchag., Kazan, Tobolski, *arslan*, *aslan*; Kuman *astlan*; Kirk. *arsilan*, *aristan* (note *t-l* interchanges); Kara Kirk. *arstan*; Teleuti Altai *arsil* "wild," *arsilaba* "bear," *arsilagu*, *arslan* "lion"; Chuwash *arghsan*; Mong. Mandju *arslan*. This word is almost common Turkic property and may or may not be a loanword in Magyar, which by the way has also the form *arselán*, which is probably a direct Osmanli loan form. The usual M. *oroslan* with intercalated vowel, between the sibilant and *l*, has as its only parallel in the above comparison the Kirk. *aristan*. The word in all the languages seems to be from *arsil* "wild" (animal) (cf. above Teleuti Altai).

ör, *öröl* "grind"; Uigur *äbür* "turn, turn off"; Osmanli *äwir* "turn around"; Tchagatai *iwir*; Altai, Teleuti *äbir*; Szagai, Kojbol *ebir*; Szojoti *är*; Chuwash, Buini *avör* (Malo-Karacskini Chuwash *ar* "grind." It will be observed that the vowels *ö* and *a* in the forms above seem to be contractions of an intercalated *b-v*; cf. *kan* above, possibly for *kaban*, *kaman*.

öreg "old, large, big" (*ereg*, *örög* "big, old, aged"); Osmanli, Krim, Kirghiz *iri*; Kazan *irög* (?); Tchagatai *ärik* (*irik*); Baraba *äri* "great, coarse-grained." For the connotation "big, old," cf. Scandinavian *stor* "big," cognate with Slavonic *star* "old."

özön "flood, inundation"; Kara Kirk. *özön*, *ösön* "brook, river"; Altai Teleuti Kirk. *öök*; Karaim *özön*; Baraba *üzön* "grow, increase." Is there connection between *√öz* etc. and M. *ür* (*ärviz*) "high water" (*r-z*)?

sajt "cheese"; Chuwash *sajt*; Teherken *čogot* = *csögöt*; Karaim Troki *čighit*; Ossetian *čighä*.

sator "tent"; Uigur *čadır*; Kun *čater*; Osm. Kazan *čatir*; Kirk. *šatir*; Karaim *čatir*. This series can mean "hut or bed-curtain"; Teleuti *čadır*;

Chuwash *čadır*. This word is probably Iranian; cf. Persian *čatr*, *čitr*, *šitr*, "tent, parasol"; Sanskrit and other Indo-Aryan languages *chattra* "parasol, cover" (Milosich, *Denkmäler* 34. 271); loanword from Turkish is *šator*.

szakal, *szakáll*- "beard"; Uigur *saghal*; Kun. *sachel*; Osmanli, Tchag., Teleuti, Taranesi, Kazan *sakal*; Bashkir *hăkal*; Altai, Teleuti, Lebed group, Tchagatai, Kojbol *saghal*; Chuwash *sughal*; Mongol *sakhal*; Buriat *hakal*, *hakhul*, *sakhal* (note *s-h*); Kalmuk *sakhal*; Mandju *sala*. Clearly a common Turkic stem probably cognate with M. *szahall*.

szam really "number"; cf. *szamomra* "for me" (my part); Old Turkish *san* "number"; Uigur, Kun, Osmanli, Tchag. Kirg. Kazan, Kojbol, Taranesi *san* "number, reckoning, great number, multitude"; Bashkir *han*; Chuwash *sun* "number, counting." Note the apparently cognate form *sai* "to count, consider, keep" in Osmanli, Tchag., and Krim. The modern Osmanli word is *sayı* "number"; cf. *salmak* "to count." There appears here an evident elision of M. *-n*, through nasalization into a diphthong, cf. above *kan*, where the vowel appears to be the result of *aba-ama*. Note also Uigur *sa* "relate, speak"; Chuwash *suv*, *su*, *sughu*; Osm. Krim *saji* (see above). This is a highly interesting comparison which seems to indicate that M. *szam* is a cognate rather than a loanword.

szék "chair, bench"; Osm. *seki* "an elevated seat, bench, dais"; Tchag. *süki*; Kazan *süke*, *siki* "tatar bed"; Bashkir *hike*; Chuwash *sak*; M. *szék* may be a primitive cultural loanword.

szunyog "gnat, mosquito" (*zunüg*, *zunug*, *szunyoŋ*); Osm. *sinek*, *sinğek* "fly" (Osm. *şivri*, *sinek* "mosquito (sharp fly)"; Tchag. *sinğek* "fly" (*sinkek*); Krim. (dialect) *sinek*; Kojbol *säk* "fly" (note elision of *ng-*, *nk*), *sarikh* "gnat"; Karagöz *säk*; Altai *sek*, *sêk* "gnat fly." This word M. *szunyog* seems to be a cognate, though it may be a cultural borrowing.

tanú (*tanó*) "witness" (one who knows); Uigur *tanuk* "the witness"; Kán *tanuc*; Osm. *tanik*, *danik*; Tchag. *tanuk*; Kazan *tanük*; Common Turkic *tani*, *dani* "knows"; Mongol *tani* "know" (kennen); Kalmuk *tani* "to experience something"; Buriat *tané*; Mandju *taku* (the *k* for the nasal *n* probably was originally *nk*); Manikobi Tunguz *takin* "recognize." Cf. Osm. colloquial *tanmak* "know a person." In M. *tan* "instruction, science"; cf. *tanár* "professor" and *tanács* "counsel."

törvény "law" (*terven*, *teruin*); Old Turkic *törü* "sustom, law of, common law, decision, governmental, authority"; Uigur *törö*, *törü* "law"; Kán *törä*; Osm. *törü*; Tchag. *töre*; Kazan *türü*; Kirg. *törö* "legal decision"; Chuwash *töré*; Mong. *türü* "law, ordinance, principle, government, method"; Mandju *doro* "rule, order, custom." Note the lack of umlaut in Mandju. This is probably a cultural loanword in M.

tukor "mirror" (*tyker*, *tükör*, and perhaps *gyükör*); Chuwash *tögör*, *tügürt*, *tükör*; Krim. *tögärüh*; Kirg. *tögürök*; Mong. *tögürük* "round, circle, round dish"; cf. Tcheremis *tükhwür* "mirror." Possibly a cognate of a stem *✓kerkos*, perhaps seen in M. *kerek* "round."

zerge "chamois, goat"; Tchag. *serke* "castrated male goat"; Kirg. *serbe*, *serge* "a two year old male goat"; Teleuti *serke* "a three year old goat"; Mong. *serghe* "castrated goat." Clearly a very ancient Turkic word acquisition.

NOTES ON THE HISTORY OF THE UIGURS IN THE LATE MIDDLE AGES

GEORGE VERNADSKY

YALE UNIVERSITY

THE UIGURS, one of the oldest Turkish tribes, established their state on the banks of the River Selenga in present day Outer Mongolia in the 7th and the 8th century A. D. In the second half of the 8th century they started colonizing Eastern Turkestan. This country before long became their headquarters. The capital of the medieval Uigur kingdom in Eastern Turkestan was known as Beşbalyk ("The Five Cities"). This was first identified as the present day Urumchi.¹ Later Bretschneider suggested that Beşbalyk should be identified with Pei-ting ("Northern Court") mentioned in the description of the journey of the Taoist monk Chang chun, 1221-1224 A. D.² Pei-ting apparently was situated somewhere between Urumchi and Guchen. In 1908 a Russian scholar, B. V. Dolbezhev, explored the ruins of the medieval city known as Po-cheng-tsu, near Jimisar (Jimasa), about thirty miles from Guchen and identified them as the ruins of Beşbalyk.³ In 1914 Sir Aurel Stein visited the same ruins near Jimasa, made another plan of them and also identified them as Beşbalyk.⁴ Apparently the identification is final and should be accepted.

In the 12th century the Uigurs were obliged to recognize the suzerainty of the Kara-Kitai. Later, in the beginning of the 13th century, the Uigur prince (Idykut) became the vassal of the Mongol conqueror, Chingis Khan.⁵ The Mongol Empire disintegrated in the second half of the 13th century. Princes, belonging to different branches of the House of Chingis Khan, vied for control of Eastern

¹ J. H. Klaproth, *Mémoires relatifs à l'Asie*, vol. II (Paris, 1826), pp. 355-356.

² E. Bretschneider, *Mediaeval Researches from Eastern Asiatic Sources*, vol. I (London, 1910), p. 66 (note 157).

³ B. V. Dolbezhev, "V poiskakh razvalin Bishbalyka," *Zapiski Vostochnogo Otdeleniia Russkogo Arkheologicheskogo Obshchestva*, XXIII (Petrograd, 1915), pp. 77-122.

⁴ A. Stein, *Innermost Asia*, vol. II (Oxford, 1928), pp. 554-559.

⁵ W. Barthold [V. Bartold], *Turkestan down to the Mongol Invasion* (London, 1928), pp. 361-362.

Turkestan. First, the descendants of Ugedey claimed it, then those of Jagatay. At one time the Uigurs themselves preferred to support the claims of the Great Khans (descendants of Tuluy)—Kubilay and his successors, who ruled in China. It was the descendants of Jagatay, however, who finally succeeded in entrenching themselves in Uiguria.

The rôle of the Uigurs in medieval history of Central Asia was very important both politically and culturally. Controlling, as they did, the central section of the commercial highway from China to the Caspian Sea the Uigurs became in many respects the middlemen between the Chinese and the Indo-Iranian civilizations. Manichaeism, Buddhism, and Nestorian Christianity, each had its followers among the Uigurs. Both for their business transactions and for their religious books the Uigurs used the Sogdian script which they adapted to the needs of their own language. Later on, the Mongols borrowed the Uigur script for themselves. Both Chingis Khan and his sons used Uigur advisers in building up their chancery and administration.⁸

In spite of the important historical rôle of the Uigurs, no comprehensive history of their state and civilization is as yet available. The student interested in Uigur history has to turn to source material as well as to monographs and general works on the linguistics, history, geography, and archaeology of Central Asia.

A very brief survey of the principal research in this field would not be amiss here. The work of the Russian scholar, V. V. Grigoriev, on *Eastern Turkestan*, published (in Russian) in 1873, may be taken as a starting point since the results of all previous scientific work were taken into account by him.⁹ Information on the history of the Uigurs available in his book is still valid in spite of the subsequent discoveries. Chinese, Persian, and Arabic historical chronicles were the main sources of Grigoriev's information. He used the Chinese chronicles in a Russian translation by Hyacinth Bichurin. The other two groups he was able to use in the original, though he also referred to Russian, French, and English transla-

⁸ W. Barthold, *Turkestan down to the Mongol Invasion*, pp. 387-391. *Id.* "Turks," *Encyclopedia of Islam*, vol. IV (Leyden and London, 1934), pp. 900-907.

⁹ V. V. Grigoriev, *Vostochnyi ili Kitaiskii Turkestan* (St. Petersburg, 1873; published as a supplementary volume to the Russian edition of Ritter's *Asia*).

tions. Some of the chronicles used by Grigoriev are now available in better editions or better translations, and thus his references might be checked and in some cases revised. At the time he was writing his book, the *Tarikh-i-Rashidi* by Mirza Muhammed Haidar was not yet published in full. It was only in 1895 that this important source for the history of Eastern Turkestan was published in an English translation by Sir E. Dennison Ross.⁸ Grigoriev, however, was able to use the excerpts from the *Tarikh-i-Rashidi* quoted by Veliaminov-Zernov in the second volume of his work on the *Tsars of Kasimov* (1864).⁹

Important new material on the history of the Uigurs was produced by subsequent archaeological expeditions to both Mongolia and Eastern Turkestan. The Orkhon expedition, which was started by the Russian Geographic Society in 1886 and continued by the Russian Academy of Sciences through the 1890's, resulted in the important discovery of runic Turkish inscriptions on the rocks of Northern Mongolia. Read first by Vilhelm Thomsen, translated and commented on by V. V. Radlov, P. M. Melioransky, and other Russian scholars, these inscriptions have constituted the main stock of source material for the early period of the history of Turks in general and Uigurs in particular.¹⁰

As to archaeological exploration of Eastern Turkestan, the following expeditions might be referred to here:

Russian: 1889 (Grum-Grzhimailo); 1893-95 (Roborovsky and Kozlov); 1906-7 (Berezovsky); 1908 (Dolbezhev); 1909-1910 and 1914-1915 (Oldenburg, S. Malov).¹¹

⁸ *A History of the Moghuls of Central Asia, Being the Tarikh-i-Rashidi of Mirza Muhammad Haidar Dughlat*. An English version edited by N. Elias. The translation by E. Denison Ross (re-issue, London, 1898).

⁹ V. V. Veliaminov-Zernov, *Izsledovanie o Kasimovskikh Tsariakh i Tsarevichakh*, vol. II (St. Petersburg, 1864), pp. 130-145.

¹⁰ On the Orkhon expedition see V. Bartold, *Istoriia Izucheniia Vostoka v Evrope i Rossii*, 2d ed. (Leningrad, 1925), pp. 270-271 and 281; *Sbornik Trudov Orkhonskoi Ekspeditsii*, published by the Russian Academy of Sciences, I-V (St. Petersburg, 1892-1901); V. Thomsen, *Déchiffrement des inscriptions de l'Orkhon et de l'Enissei* (Copenhagen, 1893).

¹¹ V. Bartold, *Istoriia Izucheniia Vostoka*, pp. 281-282 (brief bibliography of the Russian expeditions to Eastern Turkestan); S. F. Oldenburg, *Russkaia Turkestanskaiia Ekspeditsiia 1909-1910 goda* (St. Petersburg, 1914); *Id.*, *Russkie arkheologicheskie issledovaniia v Vostochnom Turkestane* (Kazan, 1921).

French: 1891-1894 (Dutreuil de Rhins and F. Grenard); 1906-1909 (Pelliot).¹²

Swedish: 1893-1897 and 1899-1902 (Sven Hedin).¹³

British: 1900-1901, 1906-1908, 1913-1915 (Sir Aurel Stein).¹⁴

German: 1902-1903 (Grünwedel); 1904-1905 (Le Coq); 1905-1907 (Le Coq and Grünwedel); 1913-1914 (Le Coq).¹⁵

Japanese: 1902-1903 (Count Otani); 1907, 1910-1912 (Tachibana).¹⁶

American: 1903-1905 (Ellsworth Huntington).¹⁷

As a result of these expeditions, large amounts of both archaeological and manuscript material have become available for scientific research. New horizons have been opened before the students of linguistics, ethnology, the history of art, and the history of religion. Less attention has been paid until recently to the study of the juridical documents secured as a result of some of expeditions. It was only in 1928 that a collection of Uigur juridical documents bearing on the late Middle Ages was published by the Academy of Sciences of U. S. S. R.¹⁸ More were edited by Radlov's pupil, Malov, in

¹² Dutreuil de Rhins et F. Grenard, *Mission scientifique dans la Haute Asie*, 3 vols. (Paris, 1897-1899); F. Grenard, "La légende de Satok Boghra Khan et l'histoire," *Journal Asiatique*, 1900; P. Pelliot, "Mission en Asie Centrale," *La Géographie*, 1908; *Mission Pelliot en Asie Centrale, Publications* (Paris, 1914-1929).

¹³ Sven Hedin, *Through Asia*, 2 vols. (New York and London, 1899); *Central Asia and Tibet*, 2 vols. (London and New York, 1903).

¹⁴ Of the publications by Sir Aurel Stein see especially: *Ruins of Desert Cathay* (2 vols., London, 1912); *Serindia* (5 vols., Oxford, 1921); *Innermost Asia* (Oxford, 1928); *On Ancient Central Asian Tracks* (London, 1933).

¹⁵ A. Grünwedel, "Bericht über archäologischen Arbeiten in Idikutschari und Umgebung," *Abh. d. k. Bayer. Akad. d. Wiss.*, I. Kl., vol. XXIV (München, 1905); A. von Le Coq, *Buried Treasures of Chinese Turkestan* (London, 1928); *Id., Von Land und Leute in Ost-Turkestan* (Leipzig, 1928); *Id., Chotscho* (Berlin, 1913); *Id., Die Buddhistische Spätantike in Mittelasien*, 7 vols. (Berlin, 1922-1923); *Id., Bilderatlas zur Kunst- und Kulturgeschichte Mittelasien* (Berlin, 1925); cf. also F. W. K. Müller, "Uigurica," *Phil.-hist. Kl.*, 1908, 1910, 1922.

¹⁶ Tachibana Zui-chō, *Shin-kyō tan-ken ki* (Travels in Mongolia and Eastern Turkestan in 1907 and 1910-1912) (Tokyo, 1912; In Japanese). I am indebted to Professor K. Asakawa for this reference.

¹⁷ Ellsworth Huntington, *The Pulse of Asia* (Boston and New York, 1907).

¹⁸ W. Radloff [V. Radlov], *Uigurische Sprachdenkmäler* (Leningrad, 1928).

1932.¹⁹ I am now engaged, in collaboration with Dr. V. Basanoff, of Paris, in the study of these documents, from both the historical and the juridical points of view. In my present paper I want merely to point out the value of these documents as source material for the history of provincial administration in the Great Mongolian Empire.

Although incorporated into this Empire in 1209 the Uigurs, as has already been mentioned, retained some degree of autonomy. This resulted in the establishment of a twofold system of administration. The Khan had agents of his own whose chief duty was to supervise taxation. On the other hand, the native princes and commune elders had still some authority left. It is also necessary to take into consideration the fact that part of the land was taken over by the Khan as his own domain or for appanage of some member of his family. Such domain land (*inçü*) was subject to direct administration by the Khan's agents. The neighboring population had to supply men to work in the domains. These men claimed exemption of taxes in compensation. A characteristic document in this respect is the petition of the domain gardeners to the Khan Toghluk Timur (No. 22 in the collection published by the Academy of Sciences of U. S. S. R.).

This document has been edited by Radlov in, first, Uigur script; second, Radlov's transliteration; and third, German translation. Radlov had a peculiar system of transliteration of Uigur documents, using chiefly letters of the Russian alphabet with some admixture of Latin letters and different diacritical signs. At first he tried in his transliteration to render the supposed pronunciation of the mediaeval Uigurs. Later on, he gave up his task as hopeless.²⁰ While Radlov's system might be useful for the study of the Uigur documents from a linguistic point of view, it does not seem very practical from the point of view of a historian or a sociologist.

I am presenting here, as an experiment, a different transliteration of the document in question. I find that the use of the modern Turkish (latinized) alphabet is practical in this case. As to the nasal *n* (*ñg*), which is lacking in modern Turkish, I am rendering

¹⁹ S. E. Malov, "Uigurskie rukopisnye dokumenty ekspeditsii S. F. Oldenburger," *Zapiski Instituta Vostokovedeniia*, Vol. I (Leningrad, 1932), pp. 129 ff.

²⁰ See Malov's preface to Radlov's *Uigurische Sprachdenkmäler*, p. viii.

it by *ṛ*. The transliteration is given in numbered lines corresponding to the original.

- (1) kalan kesip inṡu bag-
- (2) ɣılarga kalan kesmiṡi yok
- (3)san Buka kan ɣakınta
- (4) [küŋ]ük İdik-kut Kitai u....
- (5) başlık elçiler birle
- (6) kalan kesip inṡu bag[ɣılar]-
- (7) ga kalan kesmiṡi yok yana bu
- (8) [kan] [ö]ze ök Kuduku Batur Irkent
- (9) Irkay elçiler birle kalan
- (10) kesip inṡu bagɣıga kalan
- (11) kesmiṡi yok yana
- (12)kan ɣakınta Yavgu Bek kalan
- (13) kesip inṡu bagɣılarga
- (14) kalan kesmiṡi yok yana
- (15) Ögedey kan ɣakınta Togluk atlık
- (16) daruga kelip inṡu bagɣılarga
- (17) kalan kesmiṡi yok yana
- (18)kan ɣakınta
- (19) Küçük İdik-kut tübanŋük
- (20) baturnı başlap kelip kalan
- (21) kesip kalan kesip inṡu bag-
- (22) ɣılarga kalan kesmiṡi yok yana
- (23) ...lim kan ɣakınta Tarıkcı bek bolup
- (24) kelip kalan kesip inṡu bagɣı-
- (25) ga kalan kesmiṡi yok yana
- (26)ısça Temür kan ɣakınta Kulun Kara
- (27) kalan kesip inṡu bagɣılarga
- (28) kalan kesmiṡi yok
- (29)kan ɣakınta Taidik elçi kelip
- (30) kalan tüŋük inṡu bagɣıka
- (31) kadılmadı yana
- (32)k kan ɣakınta Kupa ɣakır
- (33) birle Sai Buka ɣakutu
- (34) Temüke başlık elçiler birle
- (35) kalan kesip inṡu bagɣıka
- (36) kalan kesmiṡi yok yana
- (37) Emti
- (38) Togluk Temürke bagɣılarnıñ
- (39) ötük biz burunğı bu
- (40) [kan]lar ɣakıntın berü aka ini-
- (41) lerimiz birle bagrı etlep
- (42) özde alban yasak
- (43) tutmayın

- (44) [kan]larımızga küç berip yürtimiz
- (45) erti emti tar bolsar
- (46) [kan]ımız Togluk Temürniç
- (47)sinta yaman bağlarımınızı
- (48) eilep yakşı bolurı
- (49) az berür uyubumus
- (50) köb bolur kayet
- (51) tegük bağlar-
- (52) nıç köbi kaldı biz aka ini-
- (53) miz birle bolup bu yılda
- (54) aka uçup ne bütkertimiz
- (55) er bir kisi iki alban
- (56) [t]utsun teser yoklar-
- (57) mıznuç ol
- (58) alban bizniç ol
- (59)k yarlık bolsun

The English translation of the document follows.

(lines 1-2) when assessing the *kalan*, they imposed no *kalan* on the domain gardeners.

(lines 3-7) At the time ofsan Buka Khan the Little Idykt, Kytai, ... [being] at the head [of the assessment board] when assessing the *kalan* together with the envoys (*elçi*), imposed no *kalan* on the domain gardeners.

(lines 7-11) [At the time of] the same Khan, Kudan Batur and İrkay of İrkand, when assessing the *kalan* together with the envoys (*elçi*), imposed no *kalan* on the domain gardeners.

(lines 12-14) At the time of Khan, when Yavgu Beg was assessing the *kalan*, he imposed no *kalan* on the domain gardeners.

(lines 15-17) At the time of Ugedey Khan there came a *daruga* by name of Tugluk, and he imposed no *kalan* on the domain gardeners.

(lines 18-22) At the time of Khan there came the Little Idykt at the head of his subordinate knights (*batur*), and when assessing the *kalan* he imposed no *kalan* on the domain gardeners.

(lines 22-25) At the time oflim Khan there came a certain Beg Tarikchi, and when assessing the *kalan* he imposed no *kalan* on the domain gardeners.

(lines 26-28) At the time of ischa Timur Khan, when Kulun Kara assessed the *kalan*, he imposed no *kalan* on the domain gardeners.

(lines 29-31) At the time of Khan there came the Envoy (*elçi*) Taıdyk, and again did not impose (*kadılmadı*, literally "did not add"—cf. Radloff, *Versuch eines Wörterbuches der Türk-Dialekte* II. 287) any *kalan* or *tışük* on the domain gardeners.

(lines 32-36) At the time ofk Khan, Kupa Chakırcha [was at the head of the assessment board] with Sai Buka and Chakutu Temike, and when they assessed the *kalan* together with the envoys (*elçi*) they imposed no *kalan* on the domain gardeners.

(lines 37-39) Now the petition of us, the gardeners to Toghluk Timur [is as follows]:

lines 39-44) From the times of those previous Khans we cultivated the gardens together with our older and younger brothers, and there was no other *alban* or *yasak*, and we have walked giving our strength to our Khans.

(line 45) Now we have hard times.

(lines 46-50) [Under] our Khan, Toghluk Timur, we cultivate our poor gardens and [our work] is good but it gives little and our wants are many.

(lines 50-54) Out of our respective gardens very many are left [uncultivated]. While we work together with our older and younger brothers, [some?] older brothers have died during these years. What can we do?

(lines 55-59) [Now] each man is subject to two *alban*, and this is our ruin. Let [this] our *alban* be [cancelled]. Let a *yarlyk* [Khan's charter] be [issued to this effect].

Let us now comment briefly on the contents of the document.

The date must be around 1350 A. D., since the petition was apparently written in the beginning of Toghluk Timur's reign, though not in the first year of it. According to the *Tarikh-i-Rashidi* Toghluk Timur became Khan in 748 A. H., i. e. in 1347 or 1348 A. D.²¹

A long series of precedents to support the petition is quoted, but the names of most of the Khans are missing. Among those preserved we may note the name of the Khan Ugedey (line 15). Ugedey, a son to Chingis Khan, ruled as Emperor from 1229 to 1242. Thus, we may conclude from the document that there was not much change in the regime of taxation for a stretch of time of more than a century. The assessment of taxes was sometimes made by the decision of the Khan's agent alone, such as the Khan's commissioner (*daruga*, line 16) or the envoy (*elçi*, line 29); in other cases the assessment was made by native authorities, such as the Little Idyikut (line 19). As to the *beg* (lines 12, 23) he might have been in some cases a Khan's agent, but in other cases a local prince. There also were cases when the Khan's agents and the native authorities coöperated in the assessment board.

The taxes and duties referred to in the petition are the *alban*, the *kalan*, the *tüyük*, and the *yasak*. The *kalan* was one of the regular taxes in the Mongol Empire from the days of Chingis Khan on.²²

²¹ *Tarikh-i-Rashidi*, transl. by E. D. Ross, Ch. VII, p. 23.

²² Compare Rashid-ed-Din's *Compendium of Histories* (*Jami-ut-Tawarikh*), Russian translation by Berezin, Vol. I (St. Petersburg, 1858), p. 122. On the *alban* see B. Vladimirtsov, *Obshchestvennyi stroi Mongolov* (Leningrad, 1934), pp. 164-165.

We may note that both the *kalan* and the *yasak* were also collected in Russia under the Mongol domination.²³ After the emancipation of Russia from the Mongols and her Eastern expansion, the Russians in their turn collected the *yasak* from the native Siberian tribes.²⁴ Both as to the methods of assessment and as to specific taxes the situation in Eastern Turkestan was probably not dissimilar from that prevailing in other provinces of the Mongol Empire.



²³ I. N. Berezin, *Ocherki vnutrennego ustroistva Ulusa Djuchieva* (St. Petersburg, 1864), p. 471. On the possibility of some influence of Ugur law on Russian law see G. Vernadsky, "À propos des origines du servage de Kabala dans le droit russe," *Revue Historique de Droit*, 1935, pp. 360-367.

²⁴ G. Vernadsky, "Protiv Solntsa," *Russkaia Mysl*, 1914, No. 1, pp. 10, 11, 14 of the offprint; *Id.*, "Gosudarevy sluzhilye i promyshlennyye liudi v Vostochnoi Sibiri," *Zhurnal Ministerstva Narodnogo Prosveshcheniia*, 1915, No. 4, pp. 335, 346-348.

THE THEOPHANY OF THE GOD OF SINAI *

NELSON GLUECK
HEBREW UNION COLLEGE

ANY CONSIDERATION of the theophany of the God of Sinai must concern itself with the Song of Deborah in Judges 5. This song is generally considered to represent the oldest literary material in the Bible. The validity of much of its historical background is being attested in an increasing measure particularly by some of the results of archaeological research.¹ Other archaeological discoveries, however, as well as renewed careful literary analysis of Judges 5 suggest that, even aside from verse 1 and part of verse 31, some of the main body of this chapter in its present form is not original, but rather the result of secondary redaction. This portion, too, has been subjected to the same processes of revision so frequently manifest elsewhere in the Bible, as a result of which original materials have been changed in accordance with the conceptions of subsequent generations of Biblical writers. We hasten nevertheless to stress at this point our firm belief that most of the historical allusions in the Song of Deborah are correct, even as most of its present form and language are original. We direct our attention in particular to Judges 5, 3-5 which we regard as an editorial expansion inserted into the original poem. These verses read as follows:

- 3 Hear O ye kings, give ear O ye rulers,
I, unto Yahweh will I sing,
I will make music to Yahweh, the God of Israel.
- 4 O Yahweh, when Thou didst go forth out of Seir,
When Thou didst stride out of the Field of Edom,
The earth quaked, yea the heavens shook,
(The clouds also dropped water).
- 5 The mountains rocked at the presence of Yahweh,
(namely, Sinai),
At the presence of Yahweh, the God of Israel.

* The following abbreviations are used below: *Annual* = *Annual of the American Schools of Oriental Research*; *Bulletin* = *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*; *HUCA* = *Hebrew Union College Annual*; *HS* = *Die Heilige Schrift des Alten Testaments*, ed. 4; *JBL* = *Journal of Biblical Literature*.

¹ Albright, "The Song of Deborah in the Light of Archaeology," *Bulletin* 62. 26-33.

With regard to the location of Seir and Field of Edom in verse 4 there are generally two explanations, the first of which is wrong, and the second is correct only if understood in its full implications. The first explanation is that the poet actually had in mind ² the Edom east of the Arabah. That this is incorrect is indicated, even without resorting at this point to the parallels in Deut. 33:2 and Habakkuk 3:3, by the words *zē Sinai* in verse 5. Whether or not *zē-Sinai* form an explanatory gloss referring back to "mountains," as almost all scholars agree, or whether these words *zē-Sinai* represent an appellation of Yahweh "The One of Sinai," similar to the Ugaritic *d-Pīd* or the Nabataean *dhū-Sharā*,³ the inescapable conclusion from these words is that Seir-Field of Edom and Sinai are one and the same.

We share the opinion of those who regard the words *zē-Sinai* as a marginal gloss ⁴ put down by some scribe to explain "mountains" in verse 5, and indirectly Seir and Field of Edom in verse 4. Ehrlich's objection ⁵ to the use of *zē* in verse 5 in the sense "namely" is that *zē* always refers to what follows and not to what precedes. There are, however, a number of examples where *zē* definitely refers back to what precedes and also points ahead to what follows, and where it can be translated in no other wise than with "this is" or "that is," or also with "namely" or "that is to say,"⁶ which is really the sense of *zē* in *zē-Sinai*. An excellent example is found in Isaiah 23, 13 which reads in part: "Verily! the land of the Chaldeans—this is the people that never was. . . ." It is obvious, as is generally recognized, that the phrase "this is the people that never was" is a gloss.⁷ Aside from the question as to whether or not the word *Kasdim* in this verse is original or not, we believe that the words "the land of the *Kasdim*" were already contained in this verse when a glossator inserted the phrase introduced by *zē*, which can only refer back to *Kasdim*. Exactly the same type of editorial

² Kittel in *HS* 377; Ehrlich, *Randglossen zur Hebräischen Bibel*, ad loc; Moore, *Judges* 140.

³ So Albright in *JBL* 1935. 204; *Bulletin* 62. 30.

⁴ Burney, *The Book of Judges* 113; Moore, *Judges* 141.

⁵ Ehrlich, see above; cf. *Bulletin* 62. 30.

⁶ Moore, *Judges* 142.

⁷ Duhm, *Isaiah*, ad loc; cf. also I Kings 14:14 where the clause introduced by *zē* is also generally and correctly considered a marginal gloss which eventually slipped into the text.

comment is represented by *zē-Sinai*.⁸ The words *zē-Sinai* serve the same purpose with regard to "mountains" in Judges 5:5 as the explanatory gloss *Har-'Esau* which comes immediately after *Negeb* serves in Obadiah 19. This use of *zē*, then, definitely confirms the identification in Judges 5:4-5 of Seir-Field of Edom with Sinai, showing that in these verses the poet did not have the Edom east of the Arabah in mind.

The other explanation⁹ of the location of Seir and Edom in Judges 5:4 is that they are indeed to be identified with Sinai, and verses 3-5 in this chapter correctly represent Yahweh as marching to the assistance of Israel from His seat in the South. According to this explanation, however, Seir and Edom must have been located on the west side of the Arabah, or at least must have extended west of the Arabah, from the very beginnings of Israelitic history. We, too, subscribe to the opinion that Seir and Edom in Judges 5:4 are to be identified with Sinai, and must be located on the west side of the Arabah. We cannot agree, however, with the notion that at the very beginning of Israelitic history, or indeed during any part of the pre-exilic period, the names Seir and Edom were applied to the territory west of the Arabah. Our disagreement has a twofold basis, viz., archaeological and literary.

The archaeological survey of Eastern Palestine and eastern Sinai conducted by the American Schools of Oriental Research in Baghdad in conjunction with the Hebrew Union College and the Transjordan Department of Antiquities has shown that the territory of the ancient kingdom of Edom never extended west of the Arabah.¹⁰ There is no reason whatever to believe that the terms Seir and Edom were transferred at a very early period from Sinai to the territory east of the Arabah. Conversely, however, there are grounds for the assumption that at a late period, in late exilic or in post-exilic times, these terms were considered as applying to, and in numerous instances were even transferred to, the territory west of the Arabah, that is, to Sinai.

The idea that even in its early history the territory of Seir-Edom extended west of the Arabah into Sinai is based upon a misunder-

⁸ For other examples where *zē* refers to what precedes, cf. Psalm 104:24-25 and Ezra 3:12.

⁹ See Burney, *The Book of Judges* 109-111.

¹⁰ *Annual* XV; *HUCA* XI 141 ff.

standing of, or rather a failure to examine closely, a number of biblical passages, all of which in their present form must be assigned to the post-exilic period. That Seir at one time was considered to be on the west side of the Arabah is attested by such a verse as Deuteronomy 1:44, which speaks of the defeat inflicted by the Amorites on the Israelites "in Seir as far as Hormah," or Deuteronomy 1:2, which speaks of the journey of the Israelites "from Horeb via Mt. Seir to Kadesh Barnea." But an examination of Numbers 14:45 and Deuteronomy 1:19, 20, which are parallel to the verses just cited, reveals that these passages contain no references whatsoever to Seir. The references to Seir in Deuteronomy 1:2, 44 must be regarded as late glosses. I have alluded elsewhere to these verses and other nationalized accounts, such as contained in I Chronicles 4:42-43 and Joshua 11:17 and 12:7 dealing with the expansion of Israel and locating Seir on the west side of the Arabah, and need not consider them further here.¹¹ All these verses reflect the settlement of Edomites in southern Palestine after they had been dispossessed from their own country by the Nabataeans.¹² It is only in the light of this explanation of the glosses which locate Seir on the west side of the Arabah, that we can understand the gloss "Mt. Esau" which was inserted after "Negeb" in Obadiah 19. After the words "and they shall inherit the Negeb," the subject being undoubtedly the Israelites, a late glossator added in explanation of "the Negeb" the words "Har Esau," even as he added after "Shephelah" the further explanation of "Philistines." The glossator considered Har Esau to be identical with the Negeb, and therefore located on the west side of the Arabah.¹³ Obviously in his time the Negeb was occupied by the Edomites.

This post-exilic location of Seir west of the Arabah and its identification with Sinai as in Judges 5:4-5 is further demonstrated by two other post-exilic passages which also deal with the theophany of the God of Sinai. In Deuteronomy 32:2 in the post-exilic frame-work¹⁴ of the Blessing of Moses we read: "Yahweh came

¹¹ *HUCA* XI 153-154; *Annual* XV 112-113; see comment on Joshua 15:10 below.

¹² *Annual* XV 113 n. 327.

¹³ See Marti, *Dodekapropheton* (1904) 239; Nowack, *Kleine Propheten* (1922) 180; Isaiah 21:1.

¹⁴ See Steuernagel, *Das Deuteronomium u. d. Buch Josua* 174; Eissfeldt, *Einleitung i. d. Alte Testament* (1934) 260 ff.; Marti, *Deuteronomium in HS.* 323.

from Sinai, and appeared to them from Seir; He shone forth from Har Paran, and came from Meribat Kadesh."¹⁵ We find mention of the same theophany of the God of Sinai in the post-exilic passage in Habakkuk 3:3, according to which "God comes from Teiman, and the Holy One from Har Paran."¹⁶ It is seen then from the verses in Judges, Deuteronomy, and Habakkuk that Teiman, Har Paran, Meribat Kadesh, Sinai, Seir, and Field of Edom are used synonymously. To them may be added Negab and Har Esau from Obadiah 19. It is significant that in another post-exilic passage, Zachariah 9:14, which deals with the same theophany as contained in the above verses, the deity is again represented as coming from Teiman. This verse reads:

And Yahweh will appear over them, and his arrow shall go forth like lightning. Yea the Lord God will blow the trumpet and will go forth in the storms of Teiman.

The Teiman mentioned in this verse is manifestly the same one as in Habakkuk 3:3, where it is parallel to Har Paran.

The conclusion from the foregoing is that Seir-Edom could be identified with Sinai only in the post-exilic period, or at the earliest in the late exilic period. This conclusion is strengthened by an examination of the distinctive words of our verses, which, as we shall see, occur elsewhere only in late exilic and post exilic passages.

The words "Field of Edom" occur only one other time in the Bible, namely in Genesis 32:4 where they have remained to plague scholars. This passage reads:

And Jacob sent messengers before him to his brother Esau to the land of Seir to the Field of Edom.

Verse 4b, אֶרֶצָה שְׂעִיר שְׂדֵה אֱדוֹם, is a very awkward reading. Some commentators attempt to get out of the difficulty by ascribing "Field of Edom" to E, while assigning the rest of the verse to J.¹⁷ We believe Gunkel to be absolutely correct when he regards¹⁸ "Fields of Edom" as a gloss. It is certainly sufficient to read:

And Jacob sent messengers before him to his brother Esau to the land of Seir.

¹⁵ Burney, *The Book of Judges* 110; Deuteronomy 32:51; Ezekiel 47:19; 48:28; Psalm 29:8; 106:32.

¹⁶ Cf. Obadiah 8-9.

¹⁷ Procksch, *Die Genesis* (1924) 191.

¹⁸ Gunkel, *Genesis* (1922) 357.

To add to this sentence¹⁹ the words "to the Field of Edom" is to add a completely superfluous remark. Indeed, it seems generally to be the case that *sādeh* is used in the sense of "territory" or "country" only in post-exilic passages. An examination of the biblical passages in which the words שדה מואב "Field of Moab," occur, a designation most directly related to that of "Field of Edom," bears this out.²⁰

¹⁹ Indeed it does not seem at all unlikely, particularly in view of the position of אֶרֶץ שְׂעִיר in Genesis 32: 4b^a after the *ethnah* marking the close of verse 4a, that all of verse 4b is a very late gloss, and that also Seir in this verse is to be located on the west side of the Arabah. It may be that Mt. Seir referred to in the P passages in Genesis 36: 8. 9 is also similarly to be located; cf. Joshua 24: 4. It is only in the light of this interpretation of Mt. Seir that we can possibly understand the vague reference to Mt. Seir in Joshua 15: 10 contained in the P description of the territory of Judah in Joshua 15: 1-12. The words "Mt. Seir" in verse 10 were probably originally located in verse 1, where also "Edom" and "Teiman" refer explicitly to the region south of Judah.

²⁰ Cf. Hosea 12: 13; Genesis 14: 7; 36, 35; Obadiah 19; Ruth 1: 1, 6, 22; 2: 6; 4: 8; I Chronicles 1: 46; 8: 8. The seeming exceptions to this general statement are Numbers 21: 20; Judges 20: 6; I Samuel 6: 1; 27: 7, 11. In Numbers 21: 20 the clause אֲשֶׁר בְּשֵׂדֵי מוֹאָב is obviously a gloss disturbing the direct connection between "Bāmôt" and "Rôsh hap-Pisgah"; verse 20b is probably also a gloss, as is "hag-Gai" which was probably inserted by some scribe because of the presence of the same word in Deuteronomy 3: 29 (cf. 3: 27). It seems likely that "to the Valley" was first inserted in Numbers 21: 20a, and then still later the phrase "which is in the Field of Moab" to explain "to the Valley." Numbers 21: 20a should read then "And from Bamot to the top of Pisgah" (cf. Deuteronomy 3: 27); Eissfeldt, *Heuteuch-Synopsis* 181; Holzinger, *Numeri* in *HS*, 235.

In Judges 20: 6 most commentators emend "in all the Field of the inheritance of Israel" to read "in all the Field of Israel" which seems to me to be just the reverse of what should actually be done. The emendation should read "in all the inheritance of Israel," which would furnish an excellent parallel to Judges 19: 29 where in the same connection we find "in all the boundary of Israel"; cf. Isaiah 58: 14; Jeremiah 12: 14; Numbers 26: 53, 56; Deuteronomy 4: 21, etc.

It is quite probable, as Nowack has pointed out, that I Samuel 27: 7 in which the phrase "the Field of the Philistines" occurs is an editorial insertion dealing with the length of David's stay in Philistine territory. It comes much too early and abruptly in its present position at the beginning of the account of his sojourn with the Philistines, the approximate length of which is recounted in its proper place in I Samuel 29: 3. Likewise I Samuel 27: 11, which also contains the phrase "in the Field of the Philistines," is a gloss. It merely repeats what has just been explained in verse 9, and it destroys the connection between verse 10 and verse 12.

It is significant that in Habakkuk 3:12, which continues the description begun in verse 3f. of the theophany of the God of Sinai, who strides forth in the midst of cosmic disturbances from the South in behalf of His people crushing nations in His anger, we find the same verb used as in Judges 5:4. In the latter verse we read בצעד, and in Habakkuk 3:12 תצעד. The verb צעד when connected with Yahweh occurs only in these two passages, and in Psalm 68:8, which is based on Judges 5:4-5. In fact the root צעד when used also otherwise either as a verb or a noun is to be found, with two possible exceptions in II Samuel 5:24 and 6:13 only in very late passages, and predominantly in Job and Proverbs.²¹ The passage II Samuel 6:13 must be ascribed to a post-exilic author. According to this passage David offered up a sacrifice when the bearers of the ark had advanced six paces on the occasion of the final transporting of the ark to Jerusalem. An examination of the context shows that verse 13 intrudes between verse 12 and verse 14. Verse 12 ends with the statement that David brought up the ark of Yahweh to the City of David with joy. The continuation of verse 13 is in verse 14, which elaborates upon this "joy" by stating that David danced before Yahweh with all his might. Furthermore, it is to be noticed that the manner of transporting the ark changes radically in verse 13. No longer is the ark on a wagon (verse 3) which was drawn by oxen (verse 6), but is being carried by porters. The words "the bearers of the ark of Yahweh" in verse 13 definitely suggest the P authorship of this verse.²² In II Samuel 5:24 = I Chronicles 14:15 we find the noun צעד in connection with Yahweh used in a manner quite similar to the use of the verb in connection with the appearance of the God of Sinai in behalf of His people. In this passage the striding forth of Yahweh is referred to in connection with His smiting the camp of

The editor of I Samuel 27:7, 11 is probably also responsible for the present form of the first verse in I Samuel 6, wherein the phrase "in the Field of the Philistines" again occurs. One would normally expect some such expression as "in the land of the Philistines," as we find it in Genesis 21:32, 34.

²¹ Cf. Job 14:16; 18:7, 14; 31:4, 37; 34:21; Proverbs 4:12; 5:5; 7:8; 16:9; 30:29; Genesis 49:22; Jeremiah 10:5, 23; Psalm 18:37 = II Samuel 22:37; Lamentations 4:18; Isaiah 63:1 (where the text is usually emended from צעד to צעד).

²² Cf. I Kings 8:3; Joshua 3:8.

the Philistines. It seems most probable in the light of the above material that this verse must be ascribed to an extremely late final editorship.²³

The word רִנִּים in Judges 5:3 is found elsewhere only in Hakkuk 1:10; Psalm 2:2; Proverbs 8:15; 31:4; 14:28; Isaiah 40:23. The word נִסִּים in Judges 5:4 occurs in the Qal elsewhere only in Psalm 68:9; Song of Songs 5:5, 13; 4:11; Joel 4:18-19; Proverbs 5:3; Job 29:22; cf. Amos 9:13; Job 36:27.²⁴ An examination of the passages in the Bible where as in Judges 5:5 the earth quakes, רָעָשָׁה הָאָרֶץ, or similar phenomena are recorded when God intervenes in behalf of His people, reveals the interesting fact that not one of these passages can be ascribed to the pre-exilic period. They must all be assigned either to the late-exilic period or to the post-exilic period.²⁵ Related, then, to the manner of the appearance of the God of Sinai in behalf of His people are the descriptions of the cosmic disturbances which accompany His coming forth particularly on the Day of Yahweh²⁶ in behalf of His people and Zion,²⁷ as described only in late-exilic and post-exilic passages. The theophany of the God of Sinai, as well as the closely related one

²³ Perhaps all of the II Samuel 5:17-25, which, as is generally admitted, has no connection with the immediately preceding verses, must in their present form be ascribed to a late editorship.

²⁴ For נִסִּים in Judges 5:5, which word is generally considered to be corrupt, see Deuteronomy 32:2; Isaiah 44:3; 45:8; 48:21; Psalm 78:16, 44; 147:18; Proverbs 5:15; Song of Songs 4:15-16; Job 36:28; Numbers 24:7; Exodus 15:8.

²⁵ Cf. Haggai 2:6, 7; Jeremiah 10:10; Psalm 18:7-8 = II Samuel 22:7-8; 77:19; Isaiah 13:13; 24:18-19; 29:6; Ezekiel 38:19, 20; Joel 2:10; 4:14-16; Nahum 1:5; cf. also Isaiah 30:27-33; Zachariah 9:14; Isaiah 21:1 ff.; I Kings 19:9b-11a², 11a²-12. These verses in I Kings just cited represent the late, secondary account of Yahweh's appearance to Elijah; cf. with them I Kings 19:a-11a², 13-14 which give the original of this part of the Elijah story in this chapter. Literary and general ideological considerations led Morgenstern, *The Oldest Document of the Hwateuch* 32-39, to consider I Kings 19:9b-11^a, 11a²-12 as secondary; further specific proof that these verses are secondary is derived now from the comparison with the above passages which contain similar or closely related conceptions of the theophany of Yahweh, and which, as we have seen, must be assigned to the late-exilic period or to the post-exilic period.

²⁶ Cf. Ezekiel 38:19-20; Joel 2:10; 4:14-16; Isaiah 13:6, 10, 13; 24:18-22.

²⁷ Cf. Joel 4:14-16; Isaiah 24:18 f.; Haggai 2:6-7.

of the God of Zion, can be completely understood and dated only in the light of the late-exilic and post-exilic attitude of Israel toward the surrounding nations. A universalistic conception of God is the pre-requisite for the conception of a God of Sinai who strides forth from His seat there and fulfils His purpose against the nations beyond the confines of Sinai and Palestine. This conception was peculiarly characteristic of the late exilic and post-exilic periods.

In addition to the reasons cited above for considering verses 3-5 a secondary insertion in Judges 5, it is necessary to conclude that these verses are secondary from a formal literary point of view.²⁸ They break the connection between verse 2 and verse 6. Verse 2, which is generally agreed to be the real introduction²⁹ to the poem, is repeated as a refrain (the only one in the poem) in verse 9. The immediate continuation of verse 2 is to be found in verses 6-8 which describe the oppression of the Israelites by the Canaanites. These verses are properly followed by verses 9-11 in which Yahweh is praised and His righteous acts referred to as an augur of the assistance to be rendered by Him in the approaching battle. Verses 9-11, however, are unduly anticipated by verses 3-5 which voice the praises of the powerful God of Sinai, who manifests Himself in storm and earthquake in behalf of His people. Verses 3-5 also anticipate in a general stereotyped manner verses 20-21, according to which the stars from heaven fought with Sisera and the turbulent Kishon swept his army away. Verses 3-5 must therefore also from the formal literary point of view be regarded as a late interpolation into Judges 5. The archaeological, philological, and ideological considerations listed above confirm this conclusion.

Although we have attempted to point out that verses 3-5 in the Song of Deborah must be assigned at the earliest to the late-exilic period, despite the unquestioned antiquity of the rest of the chapter, it is not our belief that all of the characteristic expressions of these and related verses sprang fully developed at that time from the Israelitic consciousness. Rather, they may have been Canaanite expressions which the Israelites were able to make part of their vocabulary only after centuries of sojourn in the land. It has been pointed out that the "closest parallels and analogies between North

²⁸ *HUCA* XI 155-156.

²⁹ Burney, *The Book of Judges* 105 f.

Canaanite religious literature and the Bible are with the later books of the Bible. . . ."⁸⁰ We believe that this statement also applies to late insertions in early portions of the Bible, and that many interesting conclusions can be arrived at from a comparative study of the available materials, along the lines indicated by the above treatment. Albright⁸¹ calls attention to an Assyrian triumphal poem written in the latter half of the thirteenth century B. C., approximately a century before the Song of Deborah, wherein the expression "the mountains tremble" occurs,—an expression particularly similar to the one in Judges 5:5 and related verses. May it not be that the expression came into Biblical literature indirectly through the North-Canaanite epics, which may yet be discovered?



⁸⁰ *Bulletin* 46. 15; Albright, *The Archaeology of Palestine and the Bible*, ed. 3, p. 241.

⁸¹ *Bulletin* 62. 31.

RICHARD JAMES HORATIO GOTTHEIL 1862-1936

JOSHUA BLOCH

THE NEW YORK PUBLIC LIBRARY

WHEN RICHARD J. H. GOTTHEIL died in New York City, on Friday, May 22, 1936, there was removed from our midst a genial personality, an active scholar, and a teacher whose disciples, many in number, will carry on the traditions of that branch of learning which he endeavored to make better known in the world of scholarship.

Richard Gottheil was born in Manchester, England, on October 13, 1862. He came of a family of scholars. His father was the eminent preacher, Rabbi Gustav Gottheil,¹ a German subject, then minister of the Manchester Congregation of British Jews. In 1873 Rabbi Gottheil was called to the pulpit of Temple Emanu-el, New York City, and went there with his family. He was a distinguished preacher, a scholar of depth, and a saintly man. Rabbi Gottheil and his family soon became completely identified with the city of their adoption and enjoyed its respect, love, and confidence in an abundant measure. He died in 1903. Richard Gottheil was about eleven years of age when he arrived in New York City. He received his early education in the public schools and at the Columbia Grammar School—the oldest private school in New York City. Upon completion of his studies at Columbia College in 1881, he was awarded the A. B. degree and proceeded to Europe upon his *Wanderjahre*. He studied at the universities of Berlin, Tübingen, and Leipzig, where he took his degree (Ph. D. *summa cum laude*) in 1886. His thesis, *A Treatise on Syriac Grammar by Mar(i) Eliâ of Sobha, Edited and Translated from the Manuscript in Berlin Royal Library*² was the forerunner of a large number of studies in the Syriac language and literature which afterwards came from his pen.

Shortly after returning home in 1886, he was appointed instructor in Syriac language and literature at Columbia College. This

¹ The last published work by Dr. Gottheil, issued shortly before his death, is a biography of his father entitled *The Life of Gustav Gottheil, Memoir of a Priest in Israel*, Williamsport, Pa., 1936.

² Berlin: Wolf Peiser Verlag, 1887.

appointment came to him at a time when a mere handful of Semitic scholars were exerting much effort to give to Semitic studies a permanent place in institutions of learning on this continent. The support of Semitics in American academic life was still in its infancy. It was generally expected that Dr. Gottheil would enter the Jewish ministry, but very early in his student days he determined to devote himself to scholarship instead. The son of a rabbi and imbued with the spirit of rabbinics, while studying in Berlin he also availed himself of the courses in Jewish studies offered at the Hochschule für die Wissenschaft des Judenthums and at the Veitel-Heine Ephraim'schê Beth-Hamidrash. Consequently, when in 1887, he was appointed to the chair of Semitic languages and Rabbinical Literature at Columbia University, he entered upon his task equipped not only with a wealth of Jewish learning but also steeped in the best traditions of rabbinical lore which he acquired under the tutelage of the great Jewish scholars who were his teachers both in this country and abroad. He was the first to organize a curriculum of Semitic courses at Columbia, and taught in almost all the branches falling within the scope of the department, including many courses in Old Testament studies. In those days a knowledge of Hebrew and Greek was an essential requirement in the preparation for the Christian ministry. But for an accurate knowledge of the Sacred Scriptures more than that was necessary. The fruits of archaeology and criticism demanded their rightful place in circles where biblical studies were pursued. Few among the intelligent, church-going people of that day knew anything of the new and completely transvaluated estimate of the surviving literature of the ancient Hebrews which modern critical scholarship had arrived at. When Gottheil began his work at Columbia, it was his ambition that this altered appreciation of Hebrew literature should be widely understood and accepted by intelligent people without any disturbance of faith and without any of the painful and trying and destructive criticism which confronted the last decades of the nineteenth century. No easy task, indeed, and a rather delicate one at that; for, those were the days when Robertson Smith in Scotland, and Charles A. Briggs and Henry P. Smith in America were tried for "heretical" opinions on matters biblical.

Gottheil carried on his work at Columbia and attracted to his

courses students from the various Christian theological schools. As a Jew, he no doubt had his convictions and beliefs. Yet these were not in conflict with the results of scholarship. He felt that whatever differences might arise among scholars concerning the higher criticism of the Old Testament, they could not properly be disposed of by repeating the old dogmatic affirmations concerning the verbal inspiration and inerrancy of the Scriptures. He rightly believed that exegesis is a historical science, and should be pursued by historical methods. Without in any way offending the conservative position, he accepted the viewpoint and methodology of the higher critical school. This school was then at the height of its campaign against orthodox resistance to the "evolutionary" approach to the literature of the Bible and the life-experience underlying it. With no mean ability and with considerable dignity Gottheil constantly endeavored to enlighten and to expand the horizon of the students by pointing out that the Hebrew religion was chiefly the product of social experience and that the record of that experience in the Hebrew Bible is but a fragment surviving from a much larger body of Hebrew literature which has now perished. His judgment was formed deliberately, conditioned by an unprejudiced consideration of all the evidence.

Gottheil was not very much concerned with the noise that was made about the "higher criticism," but he was glad to see that it brought the Old Testament into the focus of controversial interest, and that there was an extraordinary revival of the study of Hebrew not only in theological seminaries but in colleges as well. It is unfortunate that this revival was of short duration. Though Gottheil had accepted the methodology and the conclusions of modern criticism of Hebrew Scriptures and of the concomitant reconstruction of the history and religion of the ancient Hebrews, he took little part in the special investigations which so largely engrossed the labors of his contemporaries in Old Testament research. In fact he published very little of importance in that field. As a very active teacher and communal worker he had too many other things to do to become a critic or an exegete pure and simple. He felt that a larger share of his time and energy should be devoted to his interests in the synagogue, in Zionism, in the problems affecting the welfare of his people everywhere rather than to the more secluded work of the scholar with its limiting purview. To be

sure, Gottheil was not unmindful of the fact that as a professional scholar he had obligations to discharge; however, he was not a pedant; nothing human was foreign to his interest. He was a man of dignity and weight among his peers and at the same time full of charm and geniality. Yet he was possessed of a native modesty which showed itself in a certain degree of reserve. To the chance acquaintance this might seem coldness but nearer association discovered in him a warmth of human interest beyond and above that of the average man, which had not been suspected at first. His self-possession and the courage with which he pursued an active interest in matters and issues—dear to him, but not always popular with others—are recalled with great admiration even by those who rarely shared his views or enthusiasm. In matters that appeared determinable to him, Gottheil had positive opinions, clearly defined and firmly held, but without controversial zeal. In the course of his life Gottheil found himself engaged in several polemical issues, but while the world loves a fracas, he abhorred bickering and quarreling.

To a unique degree Gottheil was at once scholar and teacher and learner, attaining his honors in the former capacities because he was always humble in learning. His writings are characterized by a transparent clearness of expression, lucidity of style, and fine discrimination. His teachings were marked by similar qualities. He was lucid in his exposition and always calm and judicious. He seems to have maintained a youthful enthusiasm for his chosen subject and displayed much care in initiating his disciples in the intricacies of Semitic scholarship. Yet one could not call Gottheil an "inspiring teacher." He had no oratorical power, no compelling voice or manner. To some, perhaps even to many of his pupils, he at times appeared somewhat dry and uninteresting as a teacher. But to those who had concern in his subject he was exceedingly helpful, for his keen analysis and his precise manner of statement made all his teaching luminous. His poise was extraordinary. A calmness pervaded his speech. One rarely noticed any passion in him. His students recognized him for what he was, a personality—rugged and austere in his scholarly ideals, yet most genial and kindly in personal relations.

Gottheil's long career as a teacher, his thoroughly scientific attitude, and his generous and kindly spirit, together with his

numerous and valuable contributions to the study of the Semitic literatures, have given him a world-wide recognition. He was highly honored by societies and groups of which he was a member, but it must be equally said that the honors he gained he paid for in the currency of hard work and painstaking, unselfish devotion. Among the honors which came to him are Litt. D., Columbia University, 1929; D. H. L., Jewish Institute of Religion, 1933; Chevalier de la Légion d'Honneur, 1919; Corresponding Member, Real Academia de la Historia, Madrid, 1918; Grand Officier de l'Ordre du Ouissam Alaouite Chérefien, Morocco, 1933; Honorary Fellow, Jewish Academy of Arts and Sciences, 1935.

Gottheil's early professional interests were largely in the field of Semitic literature, especially Syriac, and a number of publications, beginning in 1886, bear witness to worthwhile studies in this subject.³ Virtually in all his writings, extensive and exact learning and sobriety of judgment are equally noticeable. But, although he was very successful as a teacher of the Semitic languages, his published contributions to their philological aspect are rather meager. This is perhaps due to the fact that he never studied languages for their own sake. The unraveling of intricate purely philological problems had but little charm for him. In his hands the grammar of those Semitic languages which he taught became a tool for a better understanding of the lives and careers of the peoples whose vernaculars they once were. His clear comprehension of social processes and his historical-mindedness made him an able and interesting interpreter. In his literary work he appears to have been largely a recorder and expositor of important texts. He always harbored an ambition to become a leading modern reproducer of ancient Hebrew, Syriac, and Arabic texts. In a conversation, not so long ago, he said to me: "I am never so happy as when I am engaged in copying and deciphering an intricate text." No wonder then that he took so much delight in the decipherment, editing, and publishing of Genizah texts to which he had devoted in recent years considerable time and effort.⁴

³ His first publication was *A List of Plants and Their Properties from the Menārath Kudāš of Gregorius bar 'Ebbāyā* [Berlin, 1886], viii + 26 pp. Cf. "Berichtigungen und Zusätze zu 'A list of plants,'" *ZDMG* 43 (1889), 121-127.

⁴ Among his publications of Genizah texts is a sumptuous volume, *Fragments from the Cairo Genizah in the Freer Collection*, edited by Richard

In that long and impressive list of his writings compiled by his faithful assistant, Miss Ida Pratt, there is presented a record of the numerous literary contributions which Dr. Gottheil made during the long academic career spanning more than half a century of productive research work. Since the publication of *A List of Plants*,⁵ an ancient Syriac nomenclature of botanic lore, he made frequent contributions to the learned publications in various lands devoted to the treatment of such subjects. His description of a proposed edition of *The Syriac-Arabic-Glosses of Bar 'Alī*⁶ led to the eventual publication of the work.⁷ Concerned with the popularization of those subjects which he made his specialty, Dr. Gottheil took an active part, both as editor and contributor, in the preparation of encyclopedic works. Numerous authoritative articles from his pen appear in *The Jewish Encyclopedia*; *The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge*; *Hasting's Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics*; *The Encyclopedia Britannica*; *Johnson's Encyclopedia*; *The International Encyclopedia*; *The National Encyclopedia*; *The Standard Jewish Encyclopedia* (now in the making); *Warner's World's Best Literature*; *Harper's Encyclopedia of United States History*, and others. His book reviews invariably offered additional or corrective knowledge to that contained in the work under review. Curiously enough, he was also fond of genealogical research. An admirable work in this field in his sumptuous publication *The Belmont-Belmonte Family: A Record of 400 Years* (New York, 1917). It is a readable presentation of an interesting Jewish family record. Bibliography too claimed his attention, and interesting contributions from his pen appeared in the pages of the *Zeitschrift für hebräische Bibliographie* and of the *Bulletin of The New York Public Library*. His useful bibliography of the works of Paul Anton de Lagarde appeared in the *Proceedings of the American Oriental Society*, 1892.

In collaboration with Professor Morris Jastrow, Jr., he edited the

Gottheil and William H. Worrell. New York: Macmillan Co., 1927. xxxi + 273 pp.

⁵ See above, note 3.

⁶ See JOURNAL 14, Oct. 1889, pp. clxxxv-cxci.

⁷ *The Syriac-Arabic glosses of Ishō' bar 'Alī*. [Part 2.] Edited from the manuscripts in Oxford, London, Paris, Berlin, Leyden, and Rome by R. J. H. Gottheil. Roma, 1908-28. 496 pp. (Reale Accademia dei Lincei Atti Memorie della classe di scienze morale. Serie 5, v. 13.)

very useful *Semitic Study Series* consisting of Semitic texts for the use of students.⁸ He was also the editor of the *Columbia University Oriental Studies* and jointly with Professor John D. Prince issued the series of *Contributions to Oriental History and Philology*. Dr. Gottheil was always glad to participate in *Festschriften* issued in honor of his colleagues and peers. How regrettable that the publication of a Tribute Volume—all ready for the printer on the occasion of his seventieth birthday—had to be abandoned because of the economic depression.⁹

For many years Professor Gottheil took an active interest in learned societies both at home and abroad. He was a member and one of the founders of the Committee of American Lectures on the History of Religion, which brought the subject to the attention of our colleges and of the public by securing the best lecturers, American and foreign, in the respective fields. He served as trustee, officer, and member of many learned societies. He held the office of president in The American Society of Biblical Literature, The American Oriental Society, and in 1909-10 served as Director of the American School of Oriental Research in Jerusalem. In 1921 he served as exchange professor at the University of Strasbourg. He was on the Boards of trustees of The Jewish Institute of Religion and the Educational Alliance.

He had a passion for the espousal of the welfare of his people everywhere, and took an active part in improving their social and cultural position. As charter member and vice-president of the American Jewish Historical Society, he was concerned with the study and research in their history. As founder and first *Nasi* of the Zeta Beta Tau fraternity, he endeavored to strengthen Jewish academic fraternal life. As an ardent Zionist he was among the first to rally to the call of Dr. Theodor Herzl and served as first president of the Zionist Organization in America. He was also the first to give to the English readers a readable history of that movement.¹⁰ Any cause that elicited his interest found in him

⁸ In this series he published: *A Selection from the Syriac Julian Romance*, Edited with a Complete Glossary in English and German, Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1906. xii + 100 pp. (Semitic Study Series. no. 7.)

⁹ See G. A. Kohut in *Columbia University Quarterly*, v. 25, June 1933, pp. 137-145.

¹⁰ See his article "Zionism," in the *Jewish Encyclopedia*, v. 12, pp. 686-686; in the *New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge*, v. 12,

an ardent champion. For the zealous and courageous support of the Allied cause in the World War he was awarded the rosette of the Legion of Honor. Amidst the absorbing pursuits of scholarship and communal service he found time for frequent contributions to the columns of the daily newspapers, often on matters controversial.

A word must be said about his place in The New York Public Library. At an early date, in 1896, he joined that band of workers, who, with Dr. John Shaw Billings, its first Director, shared in the transformation of the Astor, Lenox, and Tilden Foundations into one of the greatest libraries in the world. As chief of its Oriental Division he revealed a splendid love for and appreciation of books and a sympathetic understanding of their readers. He performed his duties with patience and enthusiasm. Under his direction a number of very useful bibliographical works were issued by the Library. Altogether, he rendered distinguished service to the cause of learning wherever called upon to do so.

Prof. Gottheil will be remembered not only for his many achievements as scholar and teacher, and his courageous leadership in the cause of learning, but also for his full personality, the captivating charm of his gentle dignity, and a winsome graciousness of manner. His physical presence will be greatly missed in the life of the community in which he moved, in its social affairs, in the fellowship of scholars, but the influence of his work will endure as a lasting monument to his memory.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY OF R. J. H. GOTTHEIL

IDA A. PRATT

ORIENTAL DIVISION—NEW YORK PUBLIC LIBRARY

1886

- A list of plants and their properties from the *Monârath Kudhšê* of Gregorius bar 'Ebh râyâ edited by Richard J. H. Gottheil. (Berlin, 1886.) 2 p.l., viii, 26 p.

1887

- An Arabic version of the "Revelation of Ezra." *Hebraica*. New Haven, 1887. v. 4, p. 14-17.
- Kottke's "Das sechste Buch des *Bellum Judaicum*." *Hebraica*. New Haven, 1887. v. 3, p. 136-151.
- Die Marginalien in der Vatikan*. Hs. der *Halâkhôth Gdhôloth*. MGWJ. Krotoschin, 1887. v. 36, p. 457-461.
- On a manuscript of a Syriac lexicographical treatise, belonging to the Union Theological Seminary of New York City. *JAOS*. Proceedings May 1887. New Haven, 1889. v. 13, p. clxxxiv-clxxxv.
- On a Syriac manuscript of the New Testament belonging to the Rev. Mr. Neesan. *JAOS*. Proceedings May 1887. New Haven, 1889. v. 13, p. clxxxi-clxxxiii.
- A synopsis of Greek philosophy by Bar 'Ebh râyâ. *Hebraica*. New Haven, 1887. v. 3, p. 249-254.
- A Syriac *Bahîrâ* legend. *JAOS*. Proceedings May 1887. New Haven, 1889. v. 13, p. clxxvii-clxxxi.
- A treatise on Syriac grammar by Mâr(i) Eliâ of Sôbbâ edited and translated from the manuscripts in the Berlin Royal Library. Berlin: Wolf Peiser Verlag, 1887. 47, 71*, 54 p.

1887-1891

- History of Jewish literature* by Dr. Gustave Karpéles. Translated from the German. *Menorah Monthly*. New York, 1887-1891. v. 2-11.

1888

- Catalogue of the books contained in the Barrow library to be sold at private sale*. New York City, 1888. xiv, 237 p.
- A manuscript containing parts of the *Targûm*. *JAOS*. Proceedings October 1888. New Haven, 1890. v. 14, p. xlii-li.
- On a Syriac geographical chart. 1 pl. *JAOS*. Proceedings May 1888. New Haven, 1889. v. 13, p. ccxc-ccxciv.
- A Syriac fragment. New Haven, 1888. 206-215 p. Repr.: *Hebraica*. New Haven, 1888. v. 4, p. 206-215.
- A *Targûm* chrestomathy. (A review of Marx's *Chrestomathia Targumica*.) *Hebraica*. New Haven, 1888. v. 4, p. 189-191.
- A tract on the Syriac conjunctions. *Hebraica*. New Haven, 1888. v. 4, p. 167-173.

1889

- Berichtigungen und Zusätze zu "A list of plants". ZDMG. Leipzig, 1889. Bd. 43, p. 121-127.
- A proposed edition of the Syriac-Arabic glosses of Bar 'Ali. JAOS. Proceedings October 1889. New Haven, 1890. v. 14, p. clxxxv-cxci.
- A Syriac lexicographical tract. Hebraica. New Haven, 1889. v. 5, p. 215-229.
- Zur Textkritik der Pešittā. Akademisch-Orientalistischer Verein, Berlin. Mitteilungen. Berlin, 1889. No. 2, p. 21-28.

1890

- An Alhambra vase now in New York. 1 pl. JAOS. Proceedings May 1890 and May 1891. New Haven, 1893. v. 15, p. xxiii-xxiv, cx-cxi.
- Contributions to the history of geography. Adscensus Mentis of Gregorius Bar 'Ebhṛāyā. Berlin: W. Peiser, 1890. 48 p., 1 chart. (Akademisch-Orientalistischer Verein, Berlin. Mitteilungen. No. 3.)
- Contributions to the history of geography. Candelabrum sanctorum and Liber radiorum of Gregorius bar 'Ebhṛāyā. Hebraica. Hartford, 1890. v. 7, p. 39-55.
- Honein bar Ishāk. ZDMG. Leipzig, 1890. Bd. 44, p. 392.
- An unknown Hebrew version of the sayings of Aesop. JQR. London, 1890. v. 2, p. 533-539.

1891

- An Arabic version of the Abgar-legend. Hebraica. Hartford, 1891. v. 7, p. 268-277.
- Dawidh bar Paulos, a Syriac grammarian. JAOS. Proceedings May 1891. New Haven, 1893. v. 15, p. cxi-cxviii.

1892

- Apollonius of Tyana. ZDMG. Leipzig, 1892. Bd. 46, p. 466-470, 780.
- Bibliography of the works of Paul Anton de Lagarde. (New Haven, 1893.) 1 p.l., cexi-cexxxx p., 1 l. Repr.: JAOS. Proceedings April 1892. New Haven, 1893. v. 15, p. cexi-cexxxx.
- Contributions to the history of geography. Mimra 'al šabḥ'ā Kīlīmā. Hebraica. Chicago, 1892. v. 8, p. 65-78, v. 9, p. 117-118.
- Quotations from the Diatessaron. Journal of Biblical Literature. Boston, 1892. v. 11, p. 68-71.

1893

- An alphabet Midrash in Syriac. ZA. Berlin, 1893. Bd. 8, p. 86-99, 219-220.
- The family Almanzi. JQR. London, 1893. v. 5, p. 500-505.
- The Judæo-Aramaean dialect of Salamās. JAOS. New Haven, 1893. v. 15, p. 297-310.
- The Syriac versions of the categories of Aristotle. Hebraica. Chicago, 1893. v. 9, p. 166-215.

1894

- Arabia before Muhammad. *Reform Advocate*. Chicago, 1894. v. 7, p. 21-22, 36-39.
- The Book of Job by C. Siegfried. Critical notice. *JQR*. London, 1894. v. 6, p. 552-560.
- Columbus in Jewish literature. American Jewish Historical Society. Publications. Baltimore, 1894. no. 2, p. 129-137.
- Kitāb al-Maṭar. By Abū Zeīd Sa'īd ibn 'Aus al-Anṣārī. Transcribed and edited, with notes. Presented March 1894. *JAOS*. New Haven, 1896. v. 16, p. 282-317.
- References to Zoroaster in Syriac and Arabic literature. Classical studies in honour of Henry Drisler. New York, 1894. p. 24-51.

1896

- The Arabian nights. (Introduction.) Arabic literature. Library of the world's best literature. New York (1896). v. 2, p. 622-704.
- . Teachers' edition. New York: J. A. Hill & Co., 1902.
- Chronological sketch of the history of the Jews in Surinam. By B. Felsenthal and R. Gottheil. American Jewish Historical Society. Publications. Baltimore, 1896. no. 4, p. 1-8.
- Nathan'el al-Fayyūmī. Festschrift zum achtzigsten Geburtstage Moritz Steinschneider's. Leipzig, 1896. p. 144-147.

1897

- Bedjan's *Histoire de Mar Jabalaha*. A review. *AJSL*. Chicago, 1897. v. 13, p. 222-227.
- Hilgenfeld's *Jabalaha III*. A review. *AJSL*. Chicago, 1897. v. 13, p. 227-229.
- Jehudah Hallevi. Library of the world's best literature. New York, 1897. v. 12, p. 6889-6894.
- The Syriac expression *evangelion damepharreshē*. *JAOS*. New Haven, 1897. v. 18, p. 361-362.

1898

- Dr. Peter's "Nippur". Review. *JQR*. London, 1898. v. 11, p. 183-186.
- Notice sur une mappemonde syrienne du xiii^e siècle, notes complémentaires publiées d'après les observations de MM. R. Gottheil et C. A. Nallino, par J. B. Chabot. Comité des travaux historiques et scientifiques. Bulletin de géographie historique et descriptive. Paris, 1898. année 1898, p. 31-43.
- Semitic languages at Columbia. Columbia University Bulletin. New York, 1898. no. 19 (Mar. 1898), p. 89-102.

1899

- Benjamin Disraeli. Chautauquan. Meadville, Pa., 1899. v. 29, p. 15-19.
- Contributions to Syriac folk-medicine. *JAOS*. New Haven, 1899. v. 20, p. 186-205.

The Greek Physiologus and its Oriental translations. *Hebraica*. Chicago, 1899. v. 15, p. 120-124.

Zionism. *Century*. New York, 1899. v. 59, p. 299-301.

The Zionist movement. *North American Review*. New York, 1899. v. 169, p. 227-236.

1900

Persian literature comprising the Shah Nameh, the Rubaiyat, the Divan and the Gulistan. With a special introduction by Richard J. H. Gottheil. London & New York: The Colonial Press (1900). 2 v.

Seven unpublished Palmyrene inscriptions. *JAOS*. New Haven, 1901. v. 21, second half, p. 109-111.

1901

Contributions to the history of the Jews in Surinam. *American Jewish Historical Society*. Publications. Baltimore, 1901. no. 9, p. 129-144, 2 maps, 1 plan, 1 pl.

Fray Joseph Diaz Pimienta, alias Abraham Diaz Pimienta, and the auto-de-fé held at Seville, July 25, 1720. *American Jewish Historical Society*. Publications. Baltimore, 1901. no. 9, p. 19-28.

Gleanings from Spanish and Portuguese archives. *JQR*. London, 1901. v. 14, p. 80-95.

The Jews and Judaism. The Progress of the century. New York: Harper & Bros., 1901. p. 498-538.

A little known Bible translation. *Jewish Comment*. Baltimore, 1901. v. 14, no. 4, p. 1-3; no. 5, p. 1-3.

Syriac literature. (A review of Duval's *La Littérature syriaque*.) *AJSL*. Chicago, 1901. v. 18, p. 58-60.

1902

Bible editions. *Jewish encyclopedia*. New York, 1902. v. 3, p. 154-162.

Bible translations. *Jewish encyclopedia*. New York, 1902. v. 3, p. 185-197.

The Oriental languages at Columbia University. *Columbia University Quarterly*. New York, 1902. v. 5, p. 24-29.

A Samaritan grammar. (Review of Rosenberg's *Lehrbuch der samaritanischen Sprache und Literatur*.) *AJSL*. Chicago, 1902. v. 18, p. 188-191.

1903

British East Africa and Zionism. *Maccabæan*. New York, 1903. v. 5, p. 294-298.

A Christian Bahira legend. New York, 1903. Repr.: *ZA*. Weimar, 1898-1903. Bd. 13, p. 189-242; Bd. 14, p. 203-268; Bd. 15, p. 56-102; Bd. 17, p. 125-166.

Egypt: in medieval and modern times. *Jewish encyclopedia*. New York, 1903. v. 5, p. 60-73.

Gabriel's *Al Burdatan*. (A review.) *AJSL*. Chicago, 1903. v. 19, p. 190-192.

A glimpse into the Jewish world. The condition of the Jews in the twentieth century as seen by one of them. *World's Work*. New York, 1903. v. 6, p. 3689-3693.

The Jews and the Spanish inquisition (1622-1721). *JQR*. London, 1903. v. 15, p. 182-250.

Kishineff. *Forum*. New York, 1903. v. 35, p. 149-160.

1904

Jews in Egypt. Maccabæan. New York, 1904. v. 6, p. 219-226.

Libraries. Jewish encyclopedia. New York, 1904. v. 8, p. 71-77.

Some early Jewish Bible criticism. *Journal of Biblical Literature*. Norwood, Mass., 1904. v. 23, p. 1-12.

Some Spanish documents. 1 table. *JQR*. London, 1904. v. 16, p. 702-714.

1905

Bible Mss. in the Roman synagogues. *Zeitschrift für hebräische Bibliographie*. Frankfurt a. M., 1905. Jahrg. 9, p. 177-184.

An eleventh-century document concerning a Cairo synagogue. 1 map and 1 plan. *JQR*. London, 1907. v. 19, p. 467-539.

Jewish Jerusalem. Maccabæan. New York, 1905. v. 9, p. 273-282.

The Karaites in Egypt: a visit to an interesting sect of Jews. *Jewish Comment*. Baltimore, 1905. v. 22, no. 10, p. 2-10.

Some Hebrew manuscripts in Cairo. London, 1905. 47 p., 2 facsims. Repr.: *JQR*. London, 1904-05. v. 17, p. 609-655.

A syllabus of Jewish history. Philadelphia, 1905. 4 l. Repr.: *American Jewish year book*, 5666, p. 163-170.

1906

Les archives juives de Florence. *Revue des études juives*. Paris, 1906. v. 51, p. 303-317; v. 52, p. 114-128.

Bibliography of the pamphlets dealing with Joseph Suess Oppenheimer. *Zeitschrift für hebräische Bibliographie*. Frankfurt a. M., 1906. Jahrg. 10, p. 106-113.

The dating of their manuscripts by the Samaritans. 2 facsims. *Journal of Biblical Literature*. New York, 1906. v. 25, p. 29-48.

A distinguished family of Fatimide Cadis (al-Nu'mān) in the tenth century. *JAOS*. New Haven, 1906. v. 27, p. 217-296.

A selection from the Syriac Julian romance edited with a complete glossary in English and German. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1906. XII, 100 p. (Semitic study series, no. 7.)

Zionism. Jewish encyclopedia. New York, 1906. v. 12, p. 666-686.

1907

Al-Azhar the brilliant. The spiritual home of Islam. Bookman. New York, 1907. v. 24, p. 501-511.

An eleventh century document concerning a Cairo synagogue. Oxford: H. Hart, 1907. 75 p., plans. Repr.: *JQR*. London, 1907, v. 19, p. 467-539.

- Al-Ḥasan ibn Ibrāhīm ibn Zūlāk. *JAOS*. New Haven, 1907. v. 28, p. 254-270.
- Mohammed 'Abdu, late Mufti of Egypt. New Haven, 1907. 189-197 p.
Repr.: *JAOS*. New Haven, 1907. v. 28, p. 189-197.
- Notice sur les amulettes judéo-araméennes. *JA*. Paris, 1907. série 10, tome 9, p. 150-152.

1908

- The Cadi: the history of this institution. *Revue des études ethnographiques et sociologiques*. Paris, 1908. année 1, p. 385-393. Reprinted from the introduction to the History of the Egyptian Cadis.
- A decree in favour of the Karaites of Cairo dated 1024. *Festschrift zu Ehren des Dr. A. Harkavy*. St. Petersburg, 1908. p. 115-125.
- Dhimmis and Moslems in Egypt. *Old Testament and Semitic studies in memory of William Rainey Harper*. Chicago, 1908. v. 2, p. 351-414.
- The history of the Egyptian Cadis as compiled by Abū Omar Muḥammad ibn Yūsuf ibn Ya'qūb al-Kindi, together with additions by Abū al-Ḥasan Aḥmad ibn 'Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Burd. Edited from the unique ms. in the British Museum. Paris: P. Geuthner, 1908. xliii, 213 p.
- Jewish education in ancient times. *Maccabæan*. New York, 1908. v. 14, p. 93-105.
- The young Turks and the old Turkey. *Forum*. New York, 1908. v. 40, p. 522-536.

1908-1909

- Gli studi Ebraici in America. *Rivista Israelitica*. Firenze, 1908-09. anno 5, p. 63-69, 106-109, 145-154, 205-210; anno 6, p. 59-66, 218-222.

1908-1928

- The Syriac-Arabic glosses of Ishō 'bar 'Aḥ (Part 2). Edited from the manuscripts in Oxford, London, Paris, Berlin, Leyden and Rome. Roma, 1908-28. 496 p. 11. (Reale Accademia dei Lincei. *Atti. Memorie della classe di scienze morale*. serie 5, v. 13.)

1909

- A door from the Madrasah of Barkūk. 2 pl. *JAOS*. New Haven, 1909-10. v. 30, p. 58-60.
- The origin and history of the minaret. *JAOS*. New Haven, 1909-10. v. 30, p. 132-154.
- Some Genizah gleanings. *Mélanges Hartwig Derenbourg*. Paris, 1909. p. 33-101.

1910

- Report of the Director 1909-1910 to the Managing Committee of the American School of Oriental Research in Jerusalem. *Archaeological Institute of America. Bulletin*. Norwood, Mass., 1910. v. 1, p. 289-291.

1911

- Arabic epigraphy. (Review of Max van Berchem's *Matériaux pour un Corpus inscriptionum Arabicarum*. Partie 2.) *AJSL*. Chicago, 1911. v. 28, p. 77-80.

Egyptian art at the Metropolitan Museum. Independent. New York, 1911. v. 71, p. 1182-1188.

Semitic literatures. New York: Columbia University Press, 1911. 21-41 p. Repr.: Columbia University lectures. Lectures on literature. New York, 1911.

1912

A fetwa on the appointment of Dhimmis to office. ZA. Strassburg, 1912. Bd. 26, p. 203-214.

Figurines of Syro-Hittite art. New York: Macmillan Co., 1912. 361-365 p., 2 pl. Repr.: Studies in the history of religions; presented to C. H. Toy. New York, 1912.

Zionism. The new Schaff-Herzog encyclopedia of religious knowledge. New York, 1912. v. 12, p. 517-519.

1913

A building inscription of King Nebuchadnezzar. New York, 1913. 5 p., 1 pl. Repr.: NYPL. Bulletin. v. 17, p. 863-865.

The Peshitta text of Gen. 32, 25. JAOS. New Haven, 1913. v. 33, p. 263-264.

Two forged antiques. 1 pl. JAOS. New Haven, 1913. v. 33, p. 306-312.

1914

The beginnings of Islam. (Review of Casanova's Mohammed et la fin du monde.) AJSL. Chicago, 1914. v. 30, p. 141-145.

A history of Islam. (Review of Caetani's Chronographia Islamica.) AJSL. Chicago, 1914. v. 30, p. 145-147.

Zionism. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1914. 258 p., 4 pl., 3 port. (Movements in Judaism.)

1915

The "holy war". Homiletic Review. New York, 1915. v. 69, p. 99-105.

Ibn Ezra. Levi ben Gershon. Encyclopædia of religion and ethics. New York, 1915. v. 7, p. 67-68, 898-900.

1916

The history of Zionism. Sacher, H. Zionism and the Jewish future. London, 1916. p. 117-137.

What of Turkey? New York, 1916. 272-287 p. Repr.: Columbia University Quarterly. New York, 1916. v. 18, p. 272-287.

1917

The Belmont-Belmonte family a record of four hundred years, put together from the original documents in the archives and libraries of Spain, Portugal, Holland, England and Germany, as well as from private sources. New York; privately printed (by the Plimpton Press, Norwood, Mass.) 1917. XIII, 11., 244 p., 11., 3 pl., 1 port.

1918

- Assyria and Babylonia. A list of references in the New York Public Library. (With introduction by Dr. Gottheil.) New York, 1918. IV, 143 p. Repr.: NYPL. Bulletin. Nov.-Dec. 1917.
- "Gerusalemme Liberata." New York, 1918. 193-213 p. Repr.: Columbia University Quarterly. New York, 1918. v. 20, p. 193-213.
- The offer of the British government. Jewish Forum. New York, 1918. v. 1, p. 9-15.
- What is Zionism? Two chapters from "Zionism and the Jewish Future", contributed by C. Weizmann and R. Gottheil. London: Zionist Organization, 1918. 44 p. p. 17-44 The history of Zionism.

1919

- Armenia and the Armenians. A list of references in the New York Public Library. (Prefatory note by Dr. Gottheil.) New York, 1919. 2 p. l., 96 p. Repr.: NYPL. Bulletin. Mar.-May 1919.
- Geschichte Aegyptens im 19. Jahrhundert, 1798-1914 von Adolf Hasenclever. (Review.) American Historical Review. New York, 1920. v. 25, p. 114-117.
- Palestine. International Conciliation. New York, 1919. no. 138 (May 1919) p. 721-737.

1921

- An answer to the Dhimmis. JAOS. New Haven, 1921. v. 41, p. 383-457.
- The mandates in the Near East. Asiatic Review. London, 1921. v. 17, p. 743-746.

1922

- Ignaz Goldziher. JAOS. New Haven, 1922. v. 42, p. 189-193. Reprinted in the Moslem World, v. 13, p. 176-180.

1923

- The history of the conquest of Egypt, North Africa and Spain by Ibn 'Abd al-Hakam. Edited by C. C. Torrey. 1922. (Review.) JAOS. New Haven, 1923, v. 43, p. 144-148.
- La Littérature profane des juifs d'Égypte, d'après les découvertes faites dans les Genizoth du Caire. JA. Paris, 1923. tome 202, p. 91-97.
- A supposed work of al-Ghazālī. JAOS. New Haven, 1923. v. 43, p. 85-91.

1924

- Vocabula punica. Lodge, Gonzalez. Lexicon Playtinvm. Lipsiae, 1924. v. 1, p. 915-917.

1925

- Ancient Egypt. Sources of information in the New York Public Library. (Foreword by Dr. Gottheil.) New York: Public Library, 1925. XV, 486 p. Repr.: NYPL. Bulletin. Sept. 1923-May 1924.
- Morris Jastrow, Jr. American Jewish Historical Society. Publications. Baltimore, 1925. no. 29, p. 170-173.

1927

- A document of the fifteenth century concerning two synagogues of the Jews in old Cairo. Philadelphia: Dropsie College, 1927. 131-152 p. Repr.: JQR. New series v. 18, p. 131-152.
- A fragment on astrology from the Genizah. JAOS. New Haven, 1927. v. 47, p. 302-310.
- Fragments from the Cairo Genizah in the Freer collection edited by Richard Gottheil and William H. Worrell. New York: Macmillan Co., 1927. XXXI, 273 p., 52 facsims. (University of Michigan Studies. Humanistic series, v. 13.)
- Tit-bits from the Genizah. Vienna, 1927. 149-169 p., 7 facsims. Reprinted from the Jewish Institute of Religion, New York. Jewish studies in memory of Israel Abrahams. New York, 1927.

1928

- Arabic literature. Columbia University course in literature. New York, 1928. v. 1, p. 219-291.
- An unknown Hebrew version of the sayings of Aesop. Cincinnati, 1928. 1 p.l., 315-352 p. Repr.: Hebrew Union College Annual. Cincinnati, 1928. v. 5, p. 315-352.

1929

- A further fragment on astrology from the Genizah. 2 pl. JAOS. New Haven, 1929. v. 49, p. 291-302.

1930

- Fragments treating of medicine from the Cairo Genizah. JAOS. New Haven, 1930. v. 50, p. 112-124.
- A further astronomic fragment from the Genizah. Philadelphia: Dropsie College, 1930. 75-83 p., 3 pl. Repr.: JQR. Philadelphia, 1930. n. s., v. 21, p. 75-83.

1931

- Achmed Taimur Pasha, Theodor Nöldeke, and Edouard Sachau: an appreciation. JAOS. New Haven, 1931. v. 51, p. 104-107.
- Further fragments on medicine from the Genizah. Philadelphia: Dropsie College, 1931. 419-438 p. Repr.: JQR. Philadelphia, 1931. n. s., v. 21, p. 419-438.
- An illustrated copy of the Koran. Paris: P. Geuthner, 1931. 21-24 p., 6 pls. Repr.: Revue des études islamiques. tome 5, p. 21-24.

1932

- A Genizah fragment of a treatise on the sciences in general. JQR. Philadelphia, 1932. n. s., v. 23, p. 163-180.
- Shahnameh in Persian. An illuminated and illustrated manuscript in the Spencer Collection. 7 pl. NYPL. Bulletin. New York, 1932. v. 36, p. 543-554.
- Shahnameh in Turkish. An illuminated manuscript in the Spencer Collection. 2 pl. NYPL. Bulletin. New York, 1932. v. 36, p. 9-10.

1934

Fragments from an Arabic Common-place book. 6 pls. Institut français d'archéologie orientale. Bulletin. Le Caire, 1934. tome 34, p. 103-128.

Morocco as it is today. JAOS. New Haven, 1934. v. 54, p. 231-239.

1935

A fragment on pharmacy from the Cairo Genizah. 4 pls. JRAS. London, 1935. 1935, p. 123-144.

A fragment from a treatise on medicine. 1 pl. New York, 1935. 315-324 p. Repr.: Jewish Studies in Memory of George A. Kohut, New York; Alexander Kohut Memorial Foundation, 1935. p. 315-324.

Fragments of a short medical vocabulary from the Cairo Genizah. Philadelphia: Dropsie College 1935. 1 p.l., 7-27 p. Repr.: JQR. n. s., v. 26, p. 7-27.

A further fragment on medicine from the Genizah in Cairo. 1 pl. Le Caire, 1935. 173-176 p. Repr.: Institut français d'archéologie orientale. Memoires. tome 68, p. 173-176.

Ignazio Guidi—Selected bibliography. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1935). 458-463 p. Repr.: JAOS. v. 55, p. 458-463.

1936

The Life of Gustav Gottheil. Memoir of a priest in Israel. Williamsport, Penn.: The Bayard Press, 1936. xi, 509 p., 7 pl.

Series edited by Dr. Gottheil

Columbia University Oriental studies. New York, 1901-1929.

Contributions to Oriental history and philology. New York, 1908-1927.

Publications of which Dr. Gottheil was joint editor

Jewish encyclopedia. New York, 1901-1905.


Semitic study series. Leiden, 1902-1911.

BRIEF COMMUNICATIONS

Note on the Line of Brāhmī(?) Script on a Babylonian Tablet

IN VOL. 56 of this JOURNAL, pp. 86-88, Dr. Bobrinskoy published a note on the curious inscription occupying the vacant space on a contract tablet in cuneiform dating from the fifth (or possibly fourth) century B. C., and now preserved in the British Museum. The cuneiform text was published and translated by Pinches, more than half a century ago, but the foreign writing has remained without interpretation. Bobrinskoy suggests some resemblances to the Brāhmī alphabet, but treats them very cautiously, and declines to attempt any decipherment. He accompanies his note with a photograph which shows plainly the strange characters.

Turning over the page, after reading Professor Sapir's article, and happening to look for a moment, with curiosity, at this photograph, I was struck with a certain resemblance—indeed, a remarkable resemblance—to a familiar series of numerals, namely a regular and complete succession of the nine "Arabic" digits, in a notably modern form.



I give here a facsimile drawing made from a tracing. It is not a complete reproduction of the inscription, for in the original (as any one can see from the photograph) several of the characters are somewhat more elaborate than those of my drawing, with slightly extended lines or flourishes. It is not difficult to recognize, in the tracing, the series 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, even in this distorted form.

Beyond the "9," on the right, there are scrawled three(?) somewhat indistinct characters. Under the "2," which encroaches on the cuneiform writing, is its seeming counterpart, in almost the form of an S. The numeral "1," if it ever was so intended, now at least forms part of a monogram (an improvement?) which seems to include the digits 2 and 4. At the extreme left is the numeral 3(?).

I have no theory to offer, since I have never seen the tablet itself. I only call attention to the fact that the lines here drawn are all plainly to be seen in the photograph, and that they form the body of the inscription. I would add, that if this graffito was really made at the time of the cuneiform writing, in the fifth or fourth century B. C., rather than at a much later day, we have here a remarkable coincidence.

CHARLES C. TORREY.

Yale University.

I Have Written on the Door (Lachish Letter IV)

Among the ostraka from the early 6th century B. C. discovered by Starkey early in 1935 at Tell ed-Duweir, the ancient Lachish, and published by Torczyner in November,¹ one of the most interesting documents is that known as Letter IV. After the opening blessing it begins, "And now according to all that my lord hath sent, so hath thy servant done. I have written on the door according to all that my lord hath sent unto me." The rest of the letter need not be quoted, since it contributes nothing to the elucidation of the curious expression with which we are here concerned, "I have written on the door" (*'l hdl't*).

Torczyner recalls Jeremiah 36: 23, in which it is said that King Jehoiakim, when the roll containing Jeremiah's words was read to him, cut it to pieces and burned it, "when Jehudi had read three or four *dōlātōt*," meaning presumably "columns" or "leaves." Consequently Torczyner, who is followed in this by Ginsberg,² takes *dl't* here to mean a piece of papyrus on which the writer of this letter had written something as instructed by his superior. Albright³ prefers the literal meaning, "door," and suggests that what was written was an announcement and that the writing was done "in a public place, such as the plaster of the wall in which the city-gate was set." Cassuto⁴ transliterates without attempting to translate.

There can hardly be any doubt about the reading. While the *ṣ* is indistinct in the reproductions I have seen, it is fairly certain, and the other letters are unmistakable. Our problem is therefore purely one of interpretation.

¹ In the Bialik memorial volume, *Keneset*, Jerusalem, A. M. 5696.

² *Bulletin of the Jewish Palestine Exploration Society* III 77-86.

³ *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 61. 10-16.

⁴ *Rivista Degli Studi Orientali* XVI 163-177.

The preposition על, of course, does not necessarily mean "on." It might mean "concerning," as it does two lines below in this same letter (על דבר בית הרפא); cf. II Kings 22:13 (בכל-הכתוב עלינו). In that case דלת would not refer to the material or object to which the pen or other writing-instrument was applied, but rather to the subject treated in the letter, order, proclamation, or whatever it was. We might then perhaps read תדלות, "the poor," as in Jer. 52:15-6 (cf. [עם] הארץ, II Kings 24:14; 25:17; Jer. 40:7). (In Prov. 8:34 על is used with דלת with the meaning "at.") While such possibilities should be recognized, however, it is much more probable that the writer means "I have written on" some object or material.⁶

Was this a piece of papyrus? I must confess I find myself in agreement with the statement of Cassuto that Jer. 36:23 is "rather an obstacle than a support" to this hypothesis.⁷ If *d'latôt* means "leaves" in that passage, the reference must be to the pieces which had been joined together to make the scroll, each of them doubtless bearing one or two columns of writing. In that sense the writer of our letter might have said, "I have written on the papyrus-leaf," but the remark would seem rather inane. If a modern letter said, "I have written on the sheet of paper according to your instructions," we should ask, *What* sheet of paper? The only reasonable answer would be that the previous letter of instruction had mentioned a particular piece of paper on which something was to be written. While that is not impossible in the instance before us, it hardly seems likely. In Greek δέλτος (dimin. δελτίον) means a writing-tablet, as my colleague Professor Götze has pointed out to me. The fact is interesting in this connection, but if we infer from it that דלת here may have that meaning, the objection just stated is still relevant. There was surely some reason for mentioning the *dlt*, whatever it was.

The meaning "column" does not fit here at all. Surely the clause does not mean, "I have written in the column," to say nothing of using על in such a connection. Prof. Obermann has

⁶ The *aleph* at the end of this name, though questioned, seems to me quite clear in the reproductions of the ostrakon.

⁷ In this sense על is frequently used in the Old Testament in connection with many different nouns.

⁸ *Op. cit.* 174.

called my attention to the use of باب in Arabic in the sense of "chapter" [as in Aramaic]. But this suggests that in Jeremiah the reference may be to divisions of subject-matter comparable to chapters rather than to portions of the roll, and our writer most certainly did not mean to say, "I have written in the chapter," much less "on the chapter."

If the word means here "door," as it does in every other occurrence known to us, what is the implication? Albright's suggestion that an announcement was written on "the plaster of the wall in which the city-gate was set" is unlikely in view of the fact that דלת would hardly be the word used if that were the meaning. It indicates rather, though not necessarily, the door itself; if the city-gate is referred to, the דלת would normally be one of the swinging leaves which closed the opening (cf. especially Neh. 6:1; 7:1). The picture most naturally presented is that of posting a notice, much as Luther posted his ninety-five theses on the door of the church at Wittenberg, except that here we must suppose the words to have been directly inscribed on the door itself. (Here too, of course, one may ask, *What* door? But if the instructions received from the "lord" referred to writing on a door, it would be more natural to mention the door than would be the case with papyrus or a tablet.)

I should be glad if I could cite a clear instance of this practice in ancient Palestine. The nearest parallel I have been able to find, unfortunately, is David's "scrabbling" on the doors of the gate (על-דלתות השער) at Gath, in imitation of a lunatic (I Sam. 21:13)! The command to write the Law on the doorposts of the houses (Dt. 6:9) and in the gates (11:20) may be cited, however, as of possible significance. Indeed, with this command in mind, I cannot altogether escape the suspicion, though I have no evidence to support it, that כתב על-הדלת may have been an idiomatic expression meaning not much more than "make a note of it," or *nota bene*.

Our conclusion must be that of Cassuto, "Il senso resta incerto." The interpretation of דלת as "door," however, seems much more probable than any other that has been proposed.

MILLAR BURROWS.

Yale University.

A Nippur Tablet of Ur III

I am indebted to Dr. Legrain for permission to publish the following text which I read during a visit to the Museum of the University of Pennsylvania some summers ago. It is numbered 8291.

3 gín kù-babbar	3 shekels of silver
á Šu-dur-kib (or Gimil-dur-ùl).	the hire-price of Šudurkib
mu-I-a-kam	for one year
ki-Lugal-á-zi-da-ta	from Lugalazida
Gim- ^a Nun-gal-gé	Gim-Nungal
šu-ba-ti	received.
tukundi-bi	If
Šu-dur-kib	Šudurkib
ud-I-àm gà-la-in-dag	stand idle for one day
(R) ban-še-ta i-ág	a ban of barley he shall measure out.
mu-lugal bi-in-pà	The name of the king was invoked.
¹ A-bil...	Abil...
¹ La...	La...
¹ Lú- ^a En-lil	Lu-Enlil
¹ Ad-da-kal-la	Addakalla
lú-inim-ma-bi-me	witnesses to it.
itu kin- ^a Innina	The month of Kin-Innina
mu-en- ^a Innina Unu-ki	year Ibi Sin 2.
maš-e i-pà.	

NOTES:

1. The contingency *gà-la...dag* is sometimes translated "escape" (*rapûdu*). But, as Mr. C. J. Gadd tells me, and as Delitzsch (*Sumer. Glossar* 132, and *HWB.* 542) translated it, "to abandon," "to cease" (*naparkû*), and hence, "to cease work" is its meaning in this context. [The value *naparkû* is found in the Akkadian version of the corresponding Sumerian Law, V R 13 ff. E. A. S.]

2. This same contingency is covered by an already known Sumerian Law, one of the *Ana ittišu* series, which reads: "If a citizen hires a laborer and he dies, runs away, disappears, *gà-la-ba-an-dag* [= *it-ta-pa-ar-ka*], or falls ill, as his hire per day he shall measure out a *ban* of barley."

3. The penalty for idleness is the same in the Law and in the Museum tablet.

4. The Museum tablet is, I think, the earliest evidence of that Law in practice.

University of Manchester, England.

T. FISH.

REVIEWS OF BOOKS

The Ras Shamra Mythological Texts. By JAMES A. MONTGOMERY and ZELLIG S. HARRIS. Memoirs of the American Philosophical Society held at Philadelphia, Volume IV. Philadelphia: UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA PRESS, 1935. 134 pp.

This book will be welcomed by many as a tribute to the pace and alertness of modern scholarship in following the paths of archaeological exploration. Others may find its task greatly premature. It undertakes to furnish a manual to literary finds that are as obscure and puzzling as any laid bare by the spade of the excavator in recent times. It offers, in Hebrew transliteration, five of the exhumed cuneiform tablets, the mythological "Poems," which have been published in the original form by Virolleaud in several successive volumes of *Syria*; and it gives a "Glossary" to these and other texts from Ras Shamra as well. In introductory chapters, the authors proffer a general discussion of the finds, also a "Synopsis of the Poems" and a "Bibliography" to date. The "Philology of the Texts" is presented in a section combining, without reference in detail, theories and conceptions that have been advanced by various scholars as regards the alphabet (p. 13-15), orthography (p. 15), expression of vowels (p. 15 f.), character of the dialect (p. 16-18), morphology (p. 18-25), syntax (p. 25-27).

In undertaking the task of their essentially compilatory publication, the authors were guided by the recognition of the vast importance of the discovered texts for the student of Hebrew and the Old Testament. It is for his benefit that the present volume is offered as "an introductory handbook." He is assured that, once "he controls the larger alphabet of the tablets," he "can read the intelligible portions with the usual apparatus of Biblical Hebrew." He should also have been told, however, that unfortunately such portions are decidedly rare. Even the relatively simple texts of the "Poems" are largely made up of passages not at all "intelligible." The authors themselves have, very prudently, refrained from giving a translation of the "Poems"—an omission that is liable to disappoint the student for whom the book is primarily intended. In the "Glossary," which the authors rightly consider their most

original contribution, they have quite often added to the suggested "meanings" the warning of an interrogatory sign, and more often they have been satisfied, again very wisely, to list vocables without suggesting any connotation whatever.¹

With less restraint the authors appear to have proceeded in the more general sections of the book. Here the reader will frequently encounter matters of opinion, widely open to question, stated without reserve, as though they were "assured results of interpretation." Only one or two instances may be noted here. Mount ŠPN the authors state (a) to be the "Mountain of the North," its mythology (b) being referred to in the "dirge on Assyria" in Isaiah 14—of which (a) is extremely doubtful, and (b) plainly without any critical warrant.²

That, in Semitic script, an alphabetic character could ever have served to symbolize *vowel + consonant* (so that, e.g., the word *RŠŠM*, "heads," was intended as *R-A'-Š(i)-M* rather than *R(a)-Š(i)-M*) is an assumption incompatible with the very nature of sounds and syllables in Semitic speech.³ Yet a good deal of the authors' "Morphology" is directly or indirectly based on the theory that the three signs for glottal stop symbolize, respectively, not only 'a, 'i, 'u, but also a', i', u'. First offered (though not without some caution) by Friedrich, this theory was justly questioned by H. L. Ginsberg.⁴ The authors do refer to the latter scholar's view that "š is used to represent also the vowelless hamza" (p. 16), but do not appear to have made critical use of it.

The texts themselves, however, strongly suggest that the entire problem, not only that of š specifically, be kept in hypothetical reserve. Thus when the imperfect of verbs *primae aleph* (of the

¹ In view of the countless problems with which the student of the texts is faced in respect to their grammar as well as their lexicography, the usefulness of the "Glossary" would have been considerably increased if it had undertaken to register all occurrences of each given vocable, regardless of its "importance." Whether intentionally or by oversight, some of the vocables of the texts enumerated on p. 85 have not been listed at all (e.g., T² 1: 15 רִעֵן, 17 כִנֵן). Occasionally, inaccuracies have crept into the authors' text: A I 80 (לִכְחֵר), B IV 26 (וּתְכַרְרָה), VII 5 (אֵל).

² See now the reviewer's article in *JBL* 55 (March 1936) 23 ff.

³ Parallels to the contrary from Accadian cuneiform are decidedly gratuitous.

⁴ See *ZA*, N. F. 7, 307 f. (*Sehr stark aber ist im Inlaut mit der Möglichkeit zu rechnen*, etc.); and *JRAS* 1935, pp. 45, 47 ff.

type $Y(a)^{-}K(u)^{-}L$, $T(a)^{-}K(u)^{-}L$) appears to be written, now $Y\dot{N}KL$, $T\dot{N}R\dot{S}\dot{N}$, now $Y\dot{N}\dot{H}D$, $T\dot{N}KL$, now again $Y\dot{N}\dot{H}DM$, $T\dot{N}HB$, we must consider the possibility that the signs for *aleph* in these forms, because they stand at the end of the syllable, merely indicate the presence of ' and have no bearing on the nature of the *preceding vowel*.⁵ Similarly, when the imperfect singular of $\dot{N}\dot{S}$, "to raise, to carry," is rendered now $T\dot{S}\dot{N}$, now $T\dot{S}\dot{N}$, and the imperative singular of the same verb is found written now $\dot{S}\dot{N}$, now $\dot{S}\dot{N}$, we must again consider, at least hypothetically, that these verbal forms end in glottal stop + zero vowel (*tiššu' ša'*, less likely *tiššu' šu'*) and are, therefore, capable of using the signs for *aleph* promiscuously.⁶

That the divine name $'AL'EYN$ (or $'AL'YN$; see below) is identical with $'AL'EY$ (or $'AL'Y$), the loss of N being due to the latter form standing in the construct state, is a singularly daring statement. More likely we have here two different nominal formations, one with, the other without, the ending *ān*. Similar morphologic duplications are quite common, both as proper names and appellatives, with *ān* no doubt always intended to add a new shade of meaning; compare *rabb-ā* and *rabbān-a* ("lord, master") in Aramaic; *hägā* and (construct) *hägyan* > *hägyon* ("meditation"), *šabbāt* and *šabbātān* > *šabbātōn* ("Sabbath") in Hebrew; *riḏā* and *riḏwān* ("good pleasure"), *nisy* and *nisyān* ("forgetful-ness") in Arabic.⁷

The cuneiform script of the tablets is likely to prove the most momentous factor in the study of the evolution of the Semitic alphabet that has yet come to light. Whether "no method is apparent in the choice of signs" is a question too important and complex to

⁵ Neither their usage in the cognate Semitic dialects nor their context in the "Poems" (as far as the latter is apparent) would warrant the conclusion that any of the cited imperfects is other than of the simple stem (Qal).

⁶ It should be noted that the two writings of the imperfect are found in very much the same context: $T\dot{S} \dot{N}$ (N) GH(M) WTSH (A I 11; D II 16), so that a difference in "mode" is extremely improbable; also, that in both writings the imperative is found to stand in the singular: C 65 ($'DBTK$) and D V 12 f. ($P\dot{N}K 'AL TTN$); see B VII 5.

⁷ Cf. such proper names as שמעון and שמעון (Lidzbarski, *Ephemeris* II, *Semitische Kosenamen, passim*) and the two very old Semitic words for "god" ʾl and ʾlā, i. e., 'il-u and 'ilāh-u (perhaps also the name of the North Arabic deity *Al-Uzza* as compared with *'Uzzayān* found in South Arabic inscriptions; see Hommel, *Chrestomathis* 39). Mark, too, that the shorter form occurs also in the absolute state (D V 17: ʾlā ʾl)!

be touched in passing at this occasion. A word, however, may be said about the authors' manner of transliteration. For reasons already mentioned, it would seem desirable to mark off the three *alephs* at the beginning of a syllable by means other than at the end of a syllable. The reviewer would suggest some such method of transliteration as \aleph , \aleph , \aleph for ' + vowel, \aleph_1 , \aleph_2 , \aleph_3 for ' + zero vowel, and mere \aleph in cases where it appears to be doubtful whether ' opens or closes the syllable (thus $\aleph\aleph$ 'ANK "I," $\aleph\aleph$ KS'AT "thrones," \aleph EL "god, El," \aleph UM "mother"; but $\aleph\aleph$ R'SM "heads," \aleph SN "sheep," $\aleph\aleph$ T'HB "she loves"; the divine name mentioned above: $\aleph\aleph$). Similarly, if instances like \aleph and \aleph are to be transcribed as \aleph and \aleph , it would seem safer to render the two *sameks*, since they symbolize one and the same sound-value (*s*), as \aleph_1 and \aleph_2 rather than \aleph and \aleph .

The authors have seen fit to leave one symbol untranscribed, preferring to indicate its occurrence by X. Consistently, they should have left at least two other symbols untransliterated instead of representing them by \aleph and \aleph , or \aleph and \aleph , respectively. What these three symbols have in common is the property of not fitting into the categories of interdialectic orthographic correspondence, which we have been wont to find when comparing the several systems of alphabetic writing hitherto at our disposal, e. g., North Semitic and South Semitic, or Hebrew and Syriac. Indeed, it appears more and more doubtful that "the larger alphabet of the tablets" is at all to be "controlled" by means of Hebrew script. In the texts from Ras Shamra we obviously find ourselves on a different plane of alphabetic writing, in a stage of the growth and making of the alphabet not necessarily measurable by the criteria from "the alphabet we know as Phoenician."

When all is said and done, the present volume may be certain to find friends among scholars, perhaps especially among those not exactly in want of being introduced to the texts from Ras Shamra. They will profit by having the five important "Poems" together and will find in the "Glossary" a valuable aid in studying this new sphere of early Semitic lexicography. It is the hope of the reviewer that the authors will accept the foregoing remarks as a token of his appreciation of their endeavors in a field greatly in need of systematic scrutiny.

JULIAN OBERMANN.

Yale University.

Woodbroke Studies: Christian Documents in Syriac, Arabic, and Garshuni, edited and translated with a critical apparatus. By A. MINGANA. Vol. VII, *Early Christian Mystics*. Cambridge: W. HEFFER & SONS, LIMITED, 1934. vii + 320 pages.

This is a fresh volume in the invaluable *Woodbroke Studies*, for which we are indebted to Professor Mingana. Its contents are unique, all published for the first time, and hailing from the hands of saints of the Oriental Church of whom we have hitherto known only the names. Like its predecessors the volume is a splendid piece of workmanship. The several original Syriac texts are reproduced by photography, and the fine paper required for this process is continued throughout the work. The name of Mr. Edward Cadbury, "without whose generosity there would have been no *Woodbroke Studies*," deserves equally to be memorialized. The presentation of the original documents in their actual form is essential for the education of the student as well as for control of the editor. Treatises of five authors are given, in some cases a number of distinct short treatises being grouped under one name. For each author the editor supplies a brief preface, of biographical character, and with remarks on the significant contents of the treatises under the name. The translations are supplied with brief footnotes, bearing on the text and translation, and with cross-references to literary works cited in the texts. For all this acute information we have to congratulate ourselves for the editor. All the authors lived in the seventh century, except one in the beginning of the eighth. The longest treatise, by Simon of Taibutheh, is a "Medico-Mystical Work," as the editor properly entitles it, and its physiology is of interest to the history of medicine; see the sections, pp. 63 f. Neither here nor in the other treatises is there any contempt of the body as in itself sinful; and also "the natural knowledge which grows and is illuminated by knowledge" is "the one which becomes clear, illuminated, and spiritual, and contemplates in an intelligible way the spiritual powers" (pp. 48 f.). The mysticism is rational, unlike much that goes under that name or in ordinary parlance. The treatises of Dadisho are studies in the spiritual training of the ascetic; the editor notes (pp. 72 f.) his interesting use of the term "the Inner Light." There is a long section on sacramental experience (pp. 90-96), also a long metrical composition of admonitions to the disciple (pp. 130-135).

The theme of Abdisho Hazzaya is that of serenity; of his brother Joseph the love of God, which however, as he maintains, involves the love of neighbor; and Abraham bar Dashandad writes a fervent and beautiful Epistle on the love of God. The translations, so far as the reviewer has made comparison, are excellently done, in good English form and not merely literal, with always apt renderings of the many philosophical terms of the original.

These treatises will be of great interest both to the student of Christian theology as also to the lover of devout literature. Further, for the history of religion, the documents constitute an invaluable addition to the materials for study of Muslim Sufism and its origin in the earlier Christian mysticism, as the editor asserts in the Preface, adding that "a thorough study of this subject is still a desideratum." One point of criticism, at least of inquiry, is to be made: the cross-references to the manuscript folios do not tally; thus on p. 10 of the translation the reference "163a" (i. e. MS p. 163, col. 1) should be 162b, and so on.

JAMES A. MONTGOMERY.

University of Pennsylvania.

By Light Light, The Mystic Gospel of Hellenistic Judaism. By EDWIN R. GOODENOUGH. New Haven: YALE UNIVERSITY PRESS, 1935. xv + 436 pp.

Philo, like Maimonides, accepted the fundamental doctrines of the Jewish religion. His conception of the divine was essentially monotheistic. He was persuaded that the Scriptures were of superhuman origin, and that the Greek version, including the accents, was equally inspired. He was firm for the fulfilment of the Law and decried his enlightened co-religionists who deprecated the observance of the ritual on the ground that the Biblical precepts were merely symbols of higher truths. But as an educated Jew who had drunk deeply from the fountains of Greek culture and philosophy, he could not but feel a profound discrepancy between Hellenic speculation and the bald statements of the Bible. He resolved this discord by a new harmonization brought about by the familiar method of allegorical interpretation (cf. Heinemann, *Alt-jüdische*

Allegoristik, Breslau, 1935, p. 70 ff.). Like his Hellenistic predecessors, Philo cherished the illusion that Moses anticipated the Greek philosophers and that his speculative notions are embedded in the Pentateuch (cf. Heinisch, *Griechische Philosophie und Altes Testament*, Münster, 1913, 7-9 who gives full citations on this point). This device afforded Philo ample opportunity to justify from Scripture the Hellenistic conceptions which he adopted as his own.

On the other hand, whereas Maimonides' broad secular culture was evenly balanced by his profound and wide Rabbinic learning, Philo's acquaintance with the Hebrew language was slight and his knowledge of Jewish law superficial.

Philo, as is well known, borrowed his philosophical ideas from diverse schools. Many scholars have taken pains to trace the sources of his ideas in Plato, Pythagoras, the Peripatetics, and the Stoics. Neither has Philo's relation to Palestinian thought been neglected. In recent times, the most valuable contribution in this field has been made by Professor Louis Ginzberg in his notes to his "Legends of the Jews."¹

That Philo adopted the terminology of the writings of the mystery religion to his allegorical interpretations was first pointed out by Carmen in 1893 (*Biblioteca Sacra*, pp. 624-7). A year later Ziegert (*Theologische Studien und Kritiken* 67.706-32) and a decade later Bousset duly noted many phraseological resemblances between Philo and the Greek mysteries. Stimulated by the original researches of Reizenstein, other scholars, such as Bréhier, Leisegang, Brögelmann, Pascher, and Cerfaux have called attention to the influence of the mystery religion on Philo.

Professor Goodenough in his very learned and instructive book has taken up these suggestions and developed them to their extreme limit. His thesis briefly is as follows: the Jews of Alexandria could not withstand the onslaught of the competing conceptions of their neighbors' religion and could not openly become initiates of Isis and Orpheus; consequently they devised the ruse of identifying

¹ Philadelphia, 1909-1926, six volumes, the last two volumes of which consist entirely of notes. Heller in his review of the *Legends*, *JQR*. N. S. 24 collected the references to Philo (pp. 170-75) and to Pseudo-Philo (*ibid.*, 184-90); Stein, *Die allegorische Exegese des Philo*, Giessen, 1929 and *Philo und der Midrasch*, Giessen, 1931, contains scarcely anything that is not available in the notes to the *Legends*.

Moses with Orpheus and Wisdom with Sophia. While in early times Judaism was recognized as a mystery religion in conscious comparison with other religions, in Philo's time "it could go on to represent itself as the only true mystery and deal with its own mythological and mystic philosophy." The conception that unites the seemingly disconnected presentation of his allegorical interpretation is the mystery with its philosophical and cosmological assumptions and its mystic goal. In short, Judaism was transformed by Philo into a full-fledged mystery religion.

While it cannot be denied that Philo borrows much of his imagery from the mysteries when he speaks of Moses as a hierophant or when he speaks of the greater or lesser mysteries and otherwise employs terms familiar to the devotees of the cult of Osiris, it is going too far to claim that Judaism has undergone such a complete metamorphosis. This excessive assertion of Prof. Goodenough is open to controversy. First, the use of figures of speech borrowed from the mystery cults is in itself no proof that Philo himself took these conceptions literally. It was most natural for him to speak in an idiom intelligible to the Gentiles whom he was addressing in many of his writings. Thus, on p. 155, Prof. Goodenough is inclined to hold that Philo seriously believed that "it is the Lord who begat Isaac." This statement clearly shows that Philo was familiar with the legend concerning the virgin birth of heroes, but he employed it merely in a metaphorical sense. Note that in *Jubilees* 19.29 Jacob is spoken of as the first-born of God, cf. *Legends* I. 317 and Conybeare, *Myth, Magic, and Morals* 199, 211, and 231. The same may be said in regard to the discussion on the divinity of Moses, pp. 223 ff. Incidentally it may be mentioned that Braudes in *Ha-boker Or* I. 262 ff. has put together the passages in the Talmud where the shortcomings of Moses are mentioned. He points out that such a tendency in the *Agada* was due to the desire to offset any possible attempt to deify Moses. Prof. Goodenough himself realized that Philo uses the terminology of the mysteries merely to bring out his philosophical ideas; cf. his remarks on p. 164.

Secondly, by skillful combinations, Prof. Goodenough has tried to show that Philo consistently pursues his interpretations along the lines of the mystery. But these combinations are in very many cases factitious. Philo, being an eclectic rather than a syn-

cretist, did not make any attempt to present a systematic philosophy. This is best seen in Philo's conception of the Logos.

Thirdly, Philo combated the observance of the mysteries as did Clement of Alexandria later on, though he too made use of their terminology. In *De Spec. Leg.* I 12 we read: "Furthermore, the law-giver also entirely removes out of his sacred code of laws all ordinances respecting initiations and mysteries and all such trickery and buffoonery. . . . Let no one therefore of the disciples or followers of Moses either be initiated himself into any mysterious rites of worship, or initiate any one else, for both, the act of learning and that of teaching such initiations is an impiety of no slight order"; cf. also Heinemann's note to his German translation, vol. II. 100. In *De Spec. Leg.* III. 7 he remarks as follows: "at all events one may see men-women continually strutting through the crowded market-place marching at the head of the procession, unholy as they are, they receive their part at the holy sacrifice, are first at the mysteries and rites of initiations and celebrate the orgies of Demeter"; cf. also Heinemann's note *loc. cit.* II. 195.

Lastly, Prof. Goodenough seeks parallels in Egyptian sources (cf. Schürer, *Geschichte* III⁴ 711) without having duly studied Philo's relation to the *Agada*. Thus, for example, on p. 266 in regard to the "man in linen garments" he remarks that white linen was the garb of Osiris; but it is quite clear that Pseudo-Philo refers to the verse in Ezekiel 10:2 which the Rabbis explain as an allusion to Gabriel; cf. *Legends* V 396. Philo has elaborated in great detail the kingship and priesthood of Moses (pp. 188-9). It should have been remarked that the Hellenistic writers before Philo as well as the Palestinian scholars, have stressed this dual rôle of Moses, cf. *Legends* VI 28-9, 73. With regard to the doctrine of God as light (p. 169) it should be recalled that this conception was known to the Biblical writers (as was already noticed by Zeller, *Philosophie der Griechen* III⁴, part 2, p. 416, note 1) and underwent quite a development in the Talmudic period. The attempt of the ancient Hebrews to form a purely spiritual idea of the Deity first led them to conceive of Him as fire which was regarded as a tenuous substance and later they evolved the more refined notion of God as light. I have collected the material on this point in Rabbinic literature which I shall present at another occasion.

A few notes are added here bearing on Philo's relation to Jewish

thought without exhausting the subject. P. 6: Pythagoras came from Haran (*Legends* V 197) and was a pupil of Ezekiel (*Legends* VI 422). P. 53: for the fact that God is not the cause of evil cf. *Legends* V 5 and 100. P. 97 ff.: for the symbolism of the priestly garments and the Tabernacle there are many points of contact in Jewish sources; cf. *Legends* III 156-73; VI 66-7. P. 100 ff.: concerning the high priest representing the Logos note that in a Rabbinic source God is termed the High Priest; cf. *Legends* VI 92. P. 108: concerning the Heavenly Temple see the thorough study on the subject by Aptowitz in *Tarbiz* II 137-53; 257-87. P. 129: in regard to the "seven pious" it seems that they correspond to the seven saints in the Clementine writings (cf. *Legends* V 12), except that in the latter Adam is mentioned instead of Enosh; on the piety of Enosh cf. *Jubilees* 19. 24 and *Legends* V 151. P. 160: concerning Sophia, the daughter of God, cf. the notion in the Midrash that the Torah is the daughter of God; see *Tanhuma Pekude* 4 and *Leviticus Rabbah* 20.10. P. 167: on the prenatal predisposition of Esau cf. *Legends* I. 313; V 271. P. 258: on art in Philo cf. Eisler, *Orphisch-Dionysisches Mysterienwesen*, Berlin, 1925, pp. 6-9. P. 265: for Moses covered with invisible light, cf. *Legends* VI 49-50. P. 275-6: on Aaron stopping the Angel of Death, cf. *Legends* VI 105. P. 291: Moses = Musaeus, cf. *Legends* V 402-3 and Eisler, *loc. cit.* 6-9. P. 292: on the influence of Philo on Clement of Alexandria, see Heinisch, *Der Einfluss Philo's auf die älteste christliche Exegese*, 1908. P. 293: on the names of Moses, cf. *Legends* II 269-70. On the slaying of the Egyptian by Moses by the Word, i. e. by pronouncing the Ineffable Name of God, cf. *Legends* II 280. On the ascension of Moses cf. *Legends* V 417. P. 294: on the identification of Joseph with Serapis cf. *Legends* VI 51. P. 302: on the beauty of Moses, cf. *Legends* V 401. P. 338: on the immutability of God cf. *Legends* V 421. P. 346: on the music of the spheres, cf. *Legends* V 37. P. 355: on the pious being received on Abraham's bosom, cf. *Jubilees* 22. 26, Joseph Halévy, *Journal Asiatique* (1902) 20. 351, and *Legends* V 268. P. 359: in regard to the Cabbala, for a general survey Prof. Ginzberg's article in the *Jewish Encyclopedia* III and Scholem, *Encyclopedia Judaica* IX should have been consulted; for the influence of Philo on the Zohar, cf. also Joel, *Religionsphilosophie des Zohar*, Leipzig, 1849, p. 349 f.

While we are not convinced of the tenability of the main thesis of the book and have noted that insufficient attention was paid to the Jewish background of Philo, Prof. Goodenough's book may be recommended as a painstaking study of the mystic philosophy of Philo; he who is equipped with the outlines of the subject will find it very instructive and suggestive.

BOAZ COHEN.

Jewish Theological Seminary, New York.

Corpus Inscriptionum Judaicarum. Vol. I, *Europe.* By P. J.-B. FREY. Rome: PONTIFICIO ISTITUTO DI ARCHEOLOGIA CRISTIANA; Paris: LIBRAIRIE ORIENTALISTE GEUTHNER, 1936. Pp. cxliv + 687. L. 200.

Some thirty years ago Seymour de Ricci, writing in the Jewish Encyclopedia, announced that he was gathering material for a Corpus of Jewish inscriptions in Greek and Latin. Since that article was written, there have appeared the special collections of the inscriptions in the catacombs of Rome (Monteverde and Villa Torlonia) by Müller-Bees and by Beyer-Lietzmann, some single inscriptions, and the sketchy list of excerpts compiled by Oehler and the bibliographies by Schuerer and Juster. Meanwhile scholars have been waiting for an up-to-date and authoritative work on the subject. Now at last it has come. Père Frey in this first volume has given all the known Greek and Latin inscriptions pertaining to Jews which have been found in various European countries—the great majority of the 700 or so items naturally come from Italy. In every case he has provided a careful transcription and a French translation together with the relevant literature, and in a great many cases he has printed a photographic cut of the stone with an admirably clear and legible text; also, in the appendices, he prints a number of doubtful (probably pagan) inscriptions and modern forgeries. The texts are introduced by a comprehensive bibliography and a long and useful discussion of the political, social, and religious life of the Jews in the Diaspora, particularly at Rome. No doubt he will discuss the great centers, Alexandria and Antioch, in the introduction to Vol. II. The texts are, of course, followed by the indispensable indices of persons, words, and symbols.

The reviewer who has himself devoted a good many hours during the past seven years to collecting material for such a Corpus is for that very reason particularly glad that this work has been undertaken and successfully completed in part by so competent a scholar as Père Frey, who has the further advantage of being able to examine at his leisure the originals in Italy and the neighboring countries. There are, to be sure, some details of interpretation in the introduction concerning which he might disagree with the learned author; but he has no hesitation in acclaiming this as the authoritative work in its field.

RALPH MARCUS.

Jewish Institute of Religion;
and Columbia University,
New York City.

Studies in Islam and Judaism: The Arabic Original of Ibn Shāhīn's Book of Comfort, Known as the Ḥibbūr Yaphē of R. Nissim b. Ya'aqobh. Edited from the Unique Manuscript by JULIAN OBERMANN [Yale Oriental Series, Researches, Vol. XVII, Published on the Foundation Established in Memory of Alexander Kohut]. New Haven: YALE UNIVERSITY PRESS, 1933. Paris: LIBRAIRIE ORIENTALISTE PAUL GEUTHNER. Pp. lix + 183 + clvi plates. \$15.00.

The Book of Comfort of the great talmudic authority R. Nissim b. Jacob ibn Shāhīn occupies a unique position in the Judeo-Arabic literature. Written in Kairuwān in the eleventh century and patterned after the Arabic *Faraj* books, it represents a most interesting collection of devotional tales, culled from both Talmudim, Babylonian and Palestinian, as well as from various early and late Midrashim, while the sources of some are probably no longer extant. Twice rendered into Hebrew and until recently known only in that language, it has enjoyed a never failing popularity among the Jews. Since the appearance of one version in Constantinople, 1519, and the other version in Ferrara, 1557, this anthology has been printed at least fifteen times and, in turn, has been translated into Yiddish and German. The object of the pious author was not merely to present a collection of pretty stories. For this, as he himself states, he had neither the training nor the inclination. He

wrote this work at the request of his father-in-law (or son-in-law? **חתן** may mean either; this part is preserved only in the second Hebrew version) to comfort him and to dispel the grief caused by the bereavement of his son, and the stories are woven in as striking illustrations of modes of ethical and religious conduct and of God's wisdom and benevolence in his dealing with men.

The unique manuscript of the Arabic original of this work was discovered by Harkavy in the Orient and reported by him in the Steinschneider *Festschrift* (Hebrew Section, pp. 17 ff.). The critical edition of this MS. by Prof. Julian Obermann, published on the Alexander Kohut Memorial Publication Fund as Vol. XVII of the Yale Oriental Series, will undoubtedly be welcomed by the student of Judeo-Arabic literature, to which it is certainly a very important contribution, as well as by the devotee of rabbinic literature. The value of this painstaking edition is greatly enhanced by the excellent facsimiles of the entire manuscript accompanying it, which is written, as could be expected, in Hebrew characters, but was transliterated by the editor into Arabic characters. As both the beginning and the end of the MS. are missing, we do not know the exact Arabic title of this work. In the Hebrew editions the book is known as **חבור יפה מהישועה**, and this led Dr. Obermann first to take its Arabic equivalent **تأليف حسن من الفرج** as its title, but this sounds rather awkward. Harkavy conjectures that it was **כתאב אזכאר אלעלמא וחו תאליף חסן פי אלפרג**. Poznański believes that the title **כתאב אלפרג בעד אלשדה ואלמעה בעד אלציקה** in a book list fragment, published by Schechter (*Saadyana*, p. 79), refers to the present work.¹ It is likely that the Hebrew title originally was **חבור (— ספר) מהישועה**, a translation of the shortened Arabic title **כתאב אלפרג**, and **יפה** was perhaps later added by some admiring publisher.

The critical apparatus consists of two sets of notes: one deals with the source-material, the wide range of which was no mean task to identify, and in fact some of it has defied identification; the other set, and by far the larger one, is of a critical nature. Four early editions and two MSS. of both Hebrew versions, often paraphrastic, were utilized by the editor in his comparative study of the text, which was also corrected wherever deemed necessary to con-

¹ Poznański, *Schechter's Saadyana* 22; cf. also his *Zur jüd.-arab. Literatur* 54, and *Esquisse historique sur les Juifs de Kairouan* 41.

form with the rules of the classical Arabic idiom. This gave rise to an amazing number of critical notes, supplemented at that by 25 pages of Addenda and Corrigenda.

Dr. Obermann's method of treating the style of this work as literary and classical may well be questioned, for it abounds in so called vulgar and dialectal forms, very frequently met with in Judeo-Arabic and Christian-Arabic literatures. However, as this method has been fully discussed and analyzed by Dr. Baneth, of the Hebrew University in Jerusalem, in his penetrating review of the present edition, where a long list of corrections is added,² there is no need to enlarge on it here. Suffice it to add that we are fortunate in possessing a specimen of Nissim ibn Shāhīn's style in the autograph letter, published by Mann in his *Texts and Studies*, I, pp. 142-45 (facsimile on p. 699), the diction of which is on the same level as that of the present work. That such a style is not limited to the literatures previously mentioned, but is occasionally employed also by Arab authors, was already shown more than fifty years ago by August Müller in his very interesting study "*Über Text und Sprachgebrauch von Ibn Abi Uṣeibi'a's Geschichte der Ärzte*." The editor of a Judeo-Arabic text is constantly faced with the problem what to do with the vulgar forms abounding there. However, with our present knowledge of this literature one may take it for granted that most of these forms emanate from the author and not from the scribe, and, as D. S. Margoliouth once stated, "It is no part of the editor's duty to correct the author's language."³

The volume is provided with two carefully prepared indexes: an Analytical Index of the source material and of the unidentified material, and an Index of Names, Persons, Terms, and Topics, both in Hebrew and in Arabic. The second volume, promised by the author, which is to include a comprehensive introduction and apparently also a text translation, will be anticipated with much interest.

SOLOMON L. SKOSS.

Dropsie College.

² *Kiryat Sefer* XI 349 ff.

³ His edition of *A Comm. on the Book of Daniel by Jepheth ibn 'Ali the Karaite* xiii.

Polemics on the Fatimi Caliphs. By Prince P. H. MAMOUR. London: LUZAC AND Co., 1934. Pp. 230. 15/-.

This is a determined attempt to establish the claim of the Fāṭimid Caliphs to descent from Fāṭimah and 'Alī and to disprove their opponents who charged that the founder of the dynasty was a descendant of a Persian heretic of obscure origin. The author points to the fact that, for a period of a hundred and one years after the accession of 'Ubaydullāh, the dynasty's claim to the sacred ancestry was not questioned. The first challenge came in 1011 A. D. when the 'Abbāsīd Caliph at Baghdad inspired a manifesto in which the "noble descent of the Fāṭimids" was denounced and their lineage traced to Maymūn al-Qaddāh, a heretic Persian oculist.

The author, resenting the "slander," and seemingly unable to remove the shadow of Maymūn from over the dynasty, accepts the pedigree but very cleverly identifies the Persian oculist with Muḥammad al-Maktūm (the concealed) son of Ismā'īl and grandson of Ja'far al-Šādiq, the sixth imam. This Muḥammad, because of the relentless 'Abbāsīd persecution, was last heard of in 765. According to the author, he fled into Persia where he assumed a new name—"Maymūn"—and a new vocation—lens grinding, hence al-Qaddāh. Maymūn was, therefore, none other than Muḥammad al-Maktūm.

If we accept this identification we cannot but accept the author's conclusion: the genuine descent of the Fāṭimids from Fāṭimah and 'Alī. The evidence, however, which the author cites, as well as all available testimony, make the identification very dubious. Prince Mamour is the first to uncover this identity, one which seems to have been neglected or forgotten by the Fāṭimids themselves at the very time when their opponents were denouncing their claim and denying their sacred ancestry.

Contes, Légendes, Coutumes Populaires du Liban et de Syrie. By MICHEL FEHAILI. Paris: ADRIEN-MAISONNEUVE, 1935. Pp. 283. 50 fr.

This is a record in the colloquial Arabic of Syria of popular stories and legends in Syria and the Lebanon and some of the cus-

toms common among the people. The colloquial Arabic text is translated into French and is, for no good reason, also accompanied by a similar transliteration. Thirteen chapters in all, they deal respectively with childbirth, the relations of the mother-in-law to her daughter-in-law, bread, an evening around the fire, a Lebanese wedding, a burial ceremony, festivities in anticipation of the harvest, the almond tree, mountain agriculture, the vine and the wine-press, the olive and the olive-press, the goat, and, finally, stomach ache.

The study of folklore and popular customs is undoubtedly enriched by such works. Nevertheless, the compiler has been very provincial and narrow in his selections. By no stretch of the imagination could the work be regarded as representative of the country or of the activities of the average inhabitant. Consequently, its value is slight.

NABIH AMIN FARIS.

Princeton, N. J.

Concordance et indices de la tradition musulmane. By A. J. WENSINCK, avec le concours de nombreux orientalistes. Leyden, 1933. Pp. 80 folio.

Histoire des croisades et du royaume franc de Jérusalem. Par RENÉ GROSSET. Vol. I: *L'anarchie musulmane et la monarchie franque (1097-1131)*. Paris, 1934. Pp. lxii + 681, with 2 maps and 4 tables.

The Kingdom of the Crusades. By DANA C. MUNRO. New York: APPLETON-CENTURY, 1935. Pp. ix + 216, with 2 maps and 8 illustrations.

Moslem Schisms and Sects (al-Farq bain al-Firak). Translated by ABRAHAM S. HALKIN. Tel-Aviv, 1935. Pp. xviii + 259.

Diwan of Khaki Khorasani. Ed. by W. IVANOW (1933); *Two Early Ismaili Treatises, i. e. Haft Babi Bab Sayyid-na and Matlubu'l-Mu'minin*, by Nasir'd-din Tusi. Ed. by W. IVANOW (1933); *True Meaning of Religion, i. e. Risala dar Haqqiqati Din*, by Shihabu' din Shah. Translated by IVANOW (1933).

Al-Islām w-al-'Ajdīd fī Miṣr. By 'ABBĀS MAḤMŪD. Cairo, 1935.
Pp. xii + 294.

Monetary and Banking System of Syria. By SA'ĪD B. ḤIMĀDEH.
Beirut: AMERICAN PRESS, 1935. Pp. xix + 368, with a
map and four charts.

The Yazīdis, Past and Present, by Ismā'īl Beg Chol. Ed. COSTI
K. ZURAYQ. Beirut: AMERICAN PRESS, 1934. Pp. xviii +
134, with 2 illustrations.

Tatawūr al-Asālib al-Nathriyah fī al-Adab al-'Arabi. By ANĪS
KḤŪRĪ AL-MAQDISI. Vol. I. Beirut: SARKIS PRESS, 1935.
Pp. 448.

'Umar ibn-abi-Rabi'ah. By JIBRĀ'IL S. JABBŪR. Vol. I, *'Aṣr
ibn-abi Rabi'ah.* Beirut: IMPRIMERIE CATHOLIQUE, 1935.
Pp. 212.

Lubnān fī 'Ahd al-Umarā al-Shihābiyyin. By AL-AMĪR ḤAYDAR
AL-SHIHĀBI. Ed. ASAD RUSTUM and Fu'ād I. AL-BUSTĀNI.
Beirut: IMPRIMERIE CATHOLIQUE, 1933. Pp. xxvi + 936.

1. Since the Great War the European output in the field of Oriental studies has been appreciably reduced through shortage of funds, the decimation of Orientalists or would-be Orientalists, and domestic problems. It is therefore a pleasant surprise to note the appearance of such a monumental work as that represented by *al-Mu'jam al-Mufahras*. This concordance and index of the literature of the Muhammadan tradition had its inception as early as 1916. In 1930 the preparation of the extensive material was finished and the work of editing and publishing begun. The concordance covers the six canonical books (al-Bukhārī, Muslim, abu-Dāwūd, al-Tirmidhi, al-Nasā'ī and ibn-Mājah), as well as al-Dārimī's *Musnad*, Mālik ibn-Anas' *Muwatta'* and Aḥmad ibn-Ḥanbal's *Musnad*. It consists of a lexicographical classification of all words of any importance in the numberless *ḥadīths* ascribed to the Prophet and the designation of the work, book and chapter in which they occur. The quotations are given in Arabic. The part under review, the first of 30, covers entries from *abada* to *Allāh*. The instructions in Arabic on the inside of the cover are not clear in two places and have a typographical error, *atba'anāha* (l. 9), which should read *atba'nāha*. Add *wāḥid* after the word *bi-isnād*

(1. 4), and substitute for *nafs al-ḥadīth* (1. 5) *al-ḥadīth mujarradan* or *al-ḥadīth bi-ʿaynihi*. Cf. the corresponding instructions in French.

2. Of much less scientific importance is a work from France dealing with the history of the Crusades. This field of investigation has been almost exhausted by German, French, and English scholarship. No one hopes to contribute much that is new unless he unearths sources that are hitherto unknown or attempts new interpretation of old and familiar facts. Grousset, whose works in the past dealt largely with art, draws his material for this volume from Western sources and from Oriental works in translation. We suspect that he could not or did not use the latter in their original languages. One of the facts he emphasizes is that the Crusading movement did not have its inception in the work of pilgrims or demagogues but in the conscience and will of medieval Europe as represented by the papacy. Another fact is that the history of the Frankish states in Syria during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries was nothing else than the first colonial expansion of France. The Crusades thus become a colonial enterprise, the founders of the Latin states the pioneers among the French colonists. The Lotharingians who went to Syria, according to the author, ceased to be German and became French.

3. The Oriental output in America has been even less meager than that of Western Europe. Grousset's work brings to mind Munro's posthumous publication. Professor Munro's study of this period was lifelong. In 1923 he undertook a trip to the Near East in order to investigate the Frankish remains and sites. The writer had the good fortune to accompany him on his visit to several of the castles and battlefields in Syria. On his return he delivered at Harvard the Lowell lectures which form the basis of the book under review. The numerous students and colleagues, whose hopes for a *magnum opus* on this subject from the pen of its foremost American exponent were shattered by his death on the eve of his retirement from Princeton, will perhaps find some measure of solace in this small volume of eight lectures.

4. Another product of American scholarship which may be singled out is a translation of the second part of al-Baghdādī's work on Islamic sects by Abraham S. Halkin. Like the first part, which was done by Kate Chambers Seelye (New York, 1919), this was submitted as a doctor's thesis at Columbia University. Dr.

Halkin had the advantage over Mrs. Seelye in having accessible the abridged edition of al-Baghdādi, which the reviewer had found in Damascus and published in Cairo (1924) and which illumines many corrupt passages in the earlier edition by Badr. Halkin provided his text with an introduction, several notes and an index and did full justice to the original. He made a real contribution by completing for the benefit of the English reader a work which though not as important as al-Shahrastāni's or ibn-Ḥazm's, is nevertheless invaluable for a full comprehension of the Islamic schools of thought and philosophic systems. Unfortunately, however, he ignored most of the diacritical marks in the introduction and bibliography and substituted the apostrophe for the 'ayn-sign. Only few minor errors were noted. *Masnād* (p. 237) should read *Musnad*; Dimashki is preferable to "Dimishki" (p. 32).

5. The depreciation in Western Oriental scholarship is being gradually compensated for by the rising native interest in these studies, a fact to be welcomed even by the Orientalists themselves. In India the progress made by the Islamic Research Association, Bombay, in the three years of its existence has been noteworthy. The membership of this association now includes Sir Aga Khan as patron, several European and American scholars as fellows and associates and a large number of Indian Moslems as ordinary members. The association has already sponsored a number of Persian texts edited and translated into English by Ivanow. What gives added importance to the Ismāʿīlite works among these publications is the fact that only few treatises written by members of this interesting schismatic sect have survived; we have hitherto depended for our information upon hostile or prejudiced sources.

6. Long before Indian Moslem scholars had begun to attempt to coördinate their activity, Egyptian research workers were taking rapid strides. One of the most significant steps taken in the last few years was the organization of a committee to translate *The Encyclopaedia of Islām*. Though poorly edited, with space unevenly allotted, and disclosing many discrepancies, this *Encyclopaedia*, which began publication the year before the Great War and has not yet been completed, is an indispensable monumental work whose translation into Arabic is bound to exercise a tremendous influence. In fact, some of the translated articles, particularly that on Abraham, have already aroused the furor of the conservative 'ulema and precipitated hot debate in the Egyptian

press. A member of this committee has issued a translation of another work, Charles C. Adams, *Islam and Modernism in Egypt* (London, 1933). 'Abbās has succeeded in producing a piece of literature in elegant Arabic with no "trace" of English in it, a feat which would not have been possible had the rendition been literal. Though free, however, the translation does not unduly violate the sense of the original. But in titles and proper names adherence to the literal meaning would have been preferable. For *al-Tajdīd*, in the title, the reviewer would suggest *al-Naz'ah al-Hadīthah* or *al-'Aṣriyah*, as doing more justice to "Modernism." Compare p. 241, where *muhdathūn* is properly used for "modernists." A literal translation into English of the title of this JOURNAL, as it is rendered on p. 240, n. 1, would be "The American Journal for Oriental Studies."

7, 8. Egypt is beginning to have a close rival in Syria, especially because of the researches of the professors of the American University of Beirut and its neighbor the Jesuit University. The publications of the professors of the American institution range from a pioneer study of the financial system of the country to delving into the secrets of the so-called devil-worshippers of northern al-'Irāq. The Yazīdi volume comprises three original texts by one of their colorful contemporary amīrs, Ismā'īl Beg Chol. The first is his autobiography. Ismā'īl took an active part in the life of his sect during the last half century and was instrumental in protecting the lives of Armenians and other Christians during the Great War. The second text is an account of Yazīdi doctrines and social and religious customs as expounded by the amīr. The third deals with some of the events of the last 150 years of Yazīdi history in Jabal Sinjār. As editor Zurayq used the critical apparatus in a way that could hardly be improved upon. His book would have profited by a map showing the Yazīdi places cited in the text and by a more careful proofreading of the table of corrections (p. 134), which commits more errors than it tries to correct. The previous studies of Furlani and Menzel supplemented by this fresh one are beginning to lift the veil that has shrouded the mysteries of this, one of the most mysterious sects of the Near East.

9. A colleague of Zurayq has produced an original study on the development of Arabic prose. The author, some of whose works have been noted previously in this JOURNAL, presents a critical examination of the various Arabic styles, traces their historical

changes from the rise of Islam to the present day and reproduces specimens. Some of the later specimens are of special interest as they are drawn from manuscripts. The book should prove of great worth to the student who may be easily lost in the labyrinth of Arabic literature. More cognizance should have been taken of the results of modern European, especially German, researches. The list of foreign words in the Koran (pp. 34-5), for instance, is taken from the fifteenth-century al-Suyūṭī, who presumably knew no other language than Arabic, and not checked against the lists of Horovitz, Fraenkel, Dvorák, and Mingana. The bibliography at the end (pp. 418-19) shows only three modern works, all in English.

10. Another study in Arabic literature is devoted to an early poet. Ibn-abi-Rabī'ah, the poet of love in the Umayyad period, was fortunate in having Paul Schwarz issue a scholarly edition of his *Diwān* (Leipzig, 1901-9) and Professor Jabbūr make a critical study of his life and times in three volumes, of which this is the first. The volume covers the political, economic, social, religious and intellectual life in Arabia during the time of the poet. The author made a worthy contribution, but did not succeed in freeing himself entirely from the stylistic tradition of classical Arabic with its insistence on piling up phrases which are synonymous or parallel. The history of the Umayyad period is sketched with hardly a date given (pp. 4-14). The Arabic word for Syria is rendered *Sūrīya* (p. 21, l. 22) and *Sūrīyah* (p. 29, l. 7), of which the latter is the preferable form.

11. Historical research is represented by a fresh edition of the most comprehensive history of Lebanon compiled by a Lebanese in the nineteenth century. The author, a scion of one of the oldest and noblest of Arab families, was a Maronite feudal lord whose villa at the small but picturesque village of Shimlān, overlooking Beirut, is still standing. The first part of his history was drawn from such standard works as al-Ṭabari and al-Mas'ūdī. The second and third parts, which are under review, deal with the period between A. H. 1109 (1697) and A. H. 1248 (1832). The author died in 1835. These are, therefore, the parts in which he made his contribution. In 1900 a graduate of the first class of the American University of Beirut, Na'ūm Mughabghab, published this history in Cairo but took liberties with the manuscript, which was already corrupt. The editors of this edition, one of the Ameri-

can University of Beirut and the other of the Université St. Joseph, have reason to think that their copy was itself the one used by the author, whose handwriting they identified on the margin. They established the text and supplied it with notes, indexes and introduction. They made no attempt to correct the semi-colloquial Arabic in which the author composed his work, a sound procedure. In listing the copies extant, no reference was made to the one originally in the Bārūdī collection and now in Princeton University Library. A comparison of the facsimile reproduction of a page of the MS (frontispiece) with the corresponding printed page (162-3) reveals an infelicitous use of the square brackets (cf. Arabic introduction, last page, and French introduction, p. xvi) and a mis-copying of one word *jumlah* for *jumlat*. The book was published at the expense of the Lebanese Republic.

PHILIP K. HITT.

Princeton University.

Three Treatises on Mysticism by Shihābuddīn Suhrawardī Maqtūl.

Edited and translated by OTTO SPIES and S. K. KHATAK.

[Bonner Orientalistische Studien, Heft 12]. Stuttgart, 1935.

Pp. 52 + 121 (text).

The works of abu-al-Futūḥ Yahya al-Suhrawardī (A. D. 1191) will probably assume added significance as interest grows in that fascinating rôle played by *al-īshrāq* (illumination) in Islamic mysticism. He has been deservedly acknowledged as the martyr philosopher of the Illuministic Sufis.

While the three Persian treatises, here edited and translated, are certainly al-Suhrawardī's less brilliant works, they, nevertheless, merit our attention. A Persian commentary on one of the treatises together with an Arabic biography of the author, drawn from Shahrazūri's *Nuzhat al-Arwāḥ*, have been appended.

In general the work bears the signs of scholarly technique. A few defects may be cited, however. The first name of the author as it appears on the cover—Shihābuddīn—might be changed to abu-al-Futūḥ, in order to avoid confusion with his namesake (1234) who carried the same surname. Moreover, Suhrawardī appears in at least two different spellings; twice on p. 6, Suhrwerdi, and twice on p. 8, Suhrwerdi. For *muḥabbat* on p. 6 read *maḥabbah*.

The first page of the Introduction refers to various studies on al-Suhrawardi, but neither here nor elsewhere in the book is there mention of Carra de Vaux whose article "La Philosophie Illuminative d'après Suhrawardi Meqtoul," in *Journal Asiatique*, sér. IX, tome XIX, Paris, 1902, pp. 63-94, though somewhat inadequate, still must be considered a milestone in the study of this Sufi luminary.

EDWARD J. JURJI.

Princeton, N. J.

Stamped and Inscribed Objects from Seleucia on the Tigris. By ROBERT HARBOLD McDOWELL. Ann Arbor: UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN PRESS, 1935. Pp. xvii + 272, with six appended plates. \$3.50.

Coins from Seleucia on the Tigris. By ROBERT HARBOLD McDOWELL. Ann Arbor: UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN PRESS, 1935. Pp. xiv + 248, with six appended plates. \$3.50.

Professor Leroy Waterman excavated at Seleucia on the Tigris from 1927 to 1932 for the University of Michigan, the Toledo Museum of Art, and, after 1930, the Cleveland Museum of Art. The results never crashed the world press but Seleucia has yielded notable new material on the ill-understood Seleucid and Parthian occupations of Mesopotamia. The publication, begun in 1934 with Debevoise's *Parthian Pottery*, is happily continued with these two sturdy volumes, nos. 36 and 37 of University of Michigan Studies, Humanistic Series, and is to be followed by a volume on figurines.

Most of the former volume is given over to a description of 203 "attached sealings," a term preferable to the loosely-used "bullae." Dr. McDowell shows that all belong to the Seleucid period, about 294-141 B. C., and classifies them by types and by purposes. Together with those from Orchoi published by Rostovtzeff in 1932 they throw the first effective light on private business and on some phases of official surveillance thereof in Seleucid Babylonia.

Miscellanea worth noting include 77 token sealings in two classes, curious clay models of Seleucid tetradrachms, monogram stamps, stamped amphora handles (here the author is in deep water; reference to a list of Rhodian month-names would have

saved trouble with nos. 2, 3, and 5 on pp. 252 f. For no. 9 read *Ἡρακλείτου* instead of *Ἡφακλείτου*), an inscribed bronze weight, and disappointing fragments from three public stelae, only one, mentioning a *ιερομνήμων* and an *ἀγωνοθέτης*, of interest.

A more rigidly correct title to the volume on coins would have noted its exclusion of Roman, Characenian, Sassanian, Mongol, and Arab coinages. Admitted are 2 coins of Alexander, 347 coins of sixty-five Seleucid issues, and 2330 Parthian coins. The latter, ranging in date from 141 B. C. (Mithradates I) to 215/6 A. D. (Volagases V), are divided by Dr. McDowell among sixty royal issues and twenty-three autonomous bronze issues, the latter yielding to royal bronze in 69/70 A. D. Many types are now first reported.

In discussing the Parthian mint at Seleucia Dr. McDowell introduces three fundamental new contentions, that Parthian tetradrachms were struck only at Seleucia, that after 123/2 B. C. Parthian drachms were never struck there, and that Seleucia alone of Parthian cities possessed an autonomous coinage. His explanations are interesting and plausible, though more evidence will be forthcoming.¹ His criticism of the Parthian king list, and his survey of the history of the western provinces of Parthia and especially of Seleucia itself, in the light of the numismatic evidence, are worth reading.

Studying the calendar employed at the Seleucia mint, Dr. McDowell has used two bronze issues, dated exceptionally by month as well as by year, not only to strengthen my thesis that at some point the correspondence of Greek month-names with Babylonian was shifted, Xanthikos taking the place of Artemisios as the equivalent of Nisannu, but even to date this shift between 16/17 and 46/47 A. D.

As a weary proofreader I was heartened by the discovery that "tessaræ" and "graffito," on pp. 232 and 235 respectively of the former volume, and the dubious nominative "Philhellenos" in the latter, passed not only the author but a distinguished group of editors and advisers. Both volumes have helpful indices and bibliographies.

JOTHAM JOHNSON.

Rowlandsville, Maryland.

¹ The excavations at Seleucia have now (Oct. 1936) been reopened under Dr. Clark Hopkins of the University of Michigan.

History of Early Iran. By GEORGE G. CAMERON. Chicago: UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS, 1935. Pp. xvi + 260. \$3.00.

Hitherto the light of history has broken on the highlands of Iran from the vantage point of full day in the valley of the Two Rivers. The very brightness in the alluvium has discouraged any clear view in the dimness of the plateau, and as a result the history of Iran has usually been assumed to begin with the Persian Empire. Our author, on the contrary, essays to take his stand on the edge of the highlands themselves, and from there report what can be seen, making the fullest use of Babylonian records as a side light. This method has everything to commend it and justifies itself at the outset by making Cyrus the Persian mark the end rather than the beginning of the work.

The book is thus a constructive attempt to present the available facts of the political history of the Iranian plateau before the rise of Cyrus the Great. Actually for the earliest historical period, the area reduces itself to Elam and as a source of documentation, it shrinks still further to a single city, the site of ancient Susa. Accordingly, this becomes the pivotal point around which the development is organized. The book unfolds twelve compact chapters fully documented with extensive footnotes.

Racially the period of prehistory is linked up to show the stratification of races and peoples in historic times. Here definiteness is reached with the Kassites and the Indo-Europeans, but no attempt is made to solve the larger ethnological problems of the region on the basis of existing sources.

Historical beginnings start from the twenty-fifth century B. C. The postdiluvian Sumerian dynastic lists show that Elamite cities were included in the complex of Babylonia and some of them were prominent in the earliest leadership. With the advent of the dynasty of Sargon I, history dawns on the highlands of Elam with Babylonia in the ascendancy, but only over a limited area. With the fall of Agade, Elam gains freedom only to be blanketed by the Gutium who overthrow Agade's rule and all records fail.

Five succeeding chapters delineate the interplay of Babylonian and Elamite forces for the most part to be expressed as a tug of war, and in spite of the vastly greater resources and culture of the valley, Elam rises to empire proportions before its end as a great power in the twelfth century B. C.

Two later chapters deal with the new Elamite kingdom, paralleling the Assyrian Empire, and Elam's final eclipse by Assyria, but the dominant theme of the last five chapters is the oncoming of the Indo-Iranians, first contacted by the Assyrians in the Zagros Mountains from the middle of the ninth century B. C. onwards. Upon nearer approach these evolve into Iranians, Medes, and Persians. The last are traced geographically from the land of Parsua (Parsuash) southwest of Lake Urmia, southeastward to Parsumash and on in the same direction to Anshan and the land of Parsa, including the later Persepolis.

The author's use of source material shows critical discrimination and insight based on careful scrutiny. Some of the more significant reconstructions of the book are those based on the Assyrian Letters. The total picture which the work presents is often fragmentary owing to the nature of the sources. But even so the ensemble is stimulating and illuminating and should serve as a useful guide and an advanced base for further penetration and elucidation of the problems which it opens up.

LEROY WATERMAN.

University of Michigan.

KEPHALAIA, Band I, *Manichäische Handschriften der staatlichen Museen Berlin*, herausgegeben im Auftrage der preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaft unter Leitung von Prof. CARL SCHMIDT. Stuttgart: VERLAG W. KOHLHAMMER, 1935. Pp. 98, in two double fasciculi. RM 12. per fasciculus.

The finding of these important Manichaean papyri is set forth in Schmidt and Polotsky's monograph, *Ein Mani-Fund in Ägypten, Originalschriften des Mani und seiner Schüler*, Sitzungsberichte der Preuss. Akad. d. Wissenschaften, 1933, p. 4 sqq. In that work, the editor calls the dialect sub-Achmimic and assumes that the translation was made from a Greek original. Professor Schmidt was assisted by Dr. Polotsky, who prepared the text and the translation of the Kephalaia. The apparatus has been limited to a few notes; no commentary beyond occasional notes has been attempted, since details cannot be studied until the whole work has appeared. In many places the original is illegible, but no rash emendations have been attempted. Many of the Greek loan-words

are repeated in parentheses beside the German equivalent in the translation; this is very helpful in comparing the translation with the Coptic text.

This Manichaean treatise opens with the conflict between darkness and light. Reference is made to the three founders of religions, Jesus, Zoroaster, and Buddha. These men, however, wrote no books, but their teachings were recorded by their pupils. Mani now asks his followers to collect his sayings after his death and to commit a small portion of his extensive wisdom to writing in order that it may not be lost. There is a succession of apostles, Sethel, Enoch, and Shem, to whom are added Buddha and Zoroaster, and finally Jesus, who appeared in a "spiritual body, without body." Brief references are made to his life, death, resurrection on the third day, and ascension. After the work of St. Paul, all mankind was misled into sin, and the Church of the Saviour was lifted on high and the world remained like a tree plucked of its fruit. At that time came the apostleship of Mani preceded by the Paraclete, who formed the image of the apostle in the time of Artabanus, king of Parthia, and Ardaschir.

Thirty-three chapters of the Kephalaia are included in the two fasciculi. According to the first chapter, Mani went by ship to India to preach and remained there until Shapur summoned him and gave him permission to preach in all his domains. In the second chapter are discussed the two trees, the one bearing good fruit and the other evil. Mani identifies the former with Jesus; the taste of the fruit of this tree is the "Holy Church" consisting of its teachers, the elect, and the catechumens. This tree has five members, of which the last is *Nous*, which is identified with "the Father, the God of Truth." In the third chapter is discussed the meaning of *εἰδαμυνία*, wisdom, and might. The theme of Chapter V is the four hunters of light and the four of darkness. Of the former, the first is the *Urmensch*; the third is Jesus, whose ship is his Holy Church; with his net of wisdom he catches souls. The fourth is the Great Thought, whose net is the Living Spirit. The four hunters of darkness try to catch men with false doctrine.

In Chapter VII is found the discussion of the five Fathers; the first is the first *Μονογενής*, the first eternal one, who has called three emanations from himself; the second Father proceeds from the first, who emits three powers, of which the third is the virgin of light, glorious wisdom. From the second Father proceeds, as an

emanation, the third Father, who is Jesus, the Shining One. He calls Light-Nous, who is the fourth Father; the latter calls a light-form, or fifth Father, who reveals himself to the elect and the catechumens.

Symbolism based on the mysterious experiences of the *Urmensch* is contained in the ninth chapter; the five signs are the salutation of peace, the right hand, the kiss of love, the showing of honour, and the laying on of hands. After having received these symbols, the believers become perfect. There are four means of escape by which the light is saved from its enemies; the fourth is that of Jesus, the Shining One, while the final one is that of Great Thought. In Chapter XXX reference is made to the Living Spirit who puts on the garments of the wind, of fire, and of water. Before the King of Honour is a wheel in which is found the complete will of this king and to which are fastened the roots of all the firmaments. When the forces of evil try to escape, they are recognized through this wheel, which is also like a mirror.

The syncretistic origin and nature of Manichaeism are clearly portrayed in the *Kephalaia*, as is apparent from these brief observations. One is also forcibly struck with the number of Biblical quotations and the great familiarity with Christian terminology.

Considering the difficulty of the text, Polotsky's translation is remarkably well done. The lines of the Coptic version and the translation on the opposite page are numbered, and so it is easy to follow the original. The work is a real contribution to the history of religions.

HENRY S. GEHMAN.

Princeton University and Princeton Theological Seminary.

The Pravacana-sāra of Kunda-kunda Ācārya, together with the commentary, Tattva-dīpikā, by Amṛtacandra Sūri. English translation by BAREND FADDEGON. Edited with an Introduction by F. W. THOMAS. Jain Literature Society Series, Volume I. Cambridge: At the UNIVERSITY PRESS; New York: THE MACMILLAN Co., 1935. Price \$5.00.

Pravacanasāra, Śrī Kundakundācārya's. A Pro-canonical Text of the Jainas. The Prakrit Text critically edited with the Sanskrit Commentaries of Amṛtacandra and Jayasena and a Hindī Commentary of Pāṇḍe Hemarāja, with an English Translation of the Text, a topical Index and a table of various readings, and with an exhaustive essay on the Life, Date and Works of Kundakunda and on the Linguistic and Philosophical aspects of Pravacanasāra, by A. N. UPADHYE. A second edition, revised, enlarged and remodeled. Bombay: ŚRĪ RĀYACHANDRA JAINA ŚĀSTRAMĀLĀ, 1935. Rupees 5.

1. The Pravacanasāra is an important doctrinal work of the Digambar sect of the Jains. This translation of the original Prakrit of Kundakunda and the Sanskrit of Amṛtacandra is made apparently from the edition of Pandit Manoharalāla, Bombay, 1912. Certain manuscripts are named in the Introduction, but there is no mention of any consultation of manuscripts, though numerous emendations are given in foot-notes.

In the Introduction Prof. Thomas discusses the life and works of Kundakunda and some of the technical terms of the Pravacanasāra. He decides that he lived probably in the third or fourth century A.D. The technical term *upayoga* (p. xxiii) is not quite so rare in Svetāmbara works as Prof. Thomas thinks. Hemacandra uses the word casually throughout the *Triṣaṣṭiśālākāpuruṣacaritra* and evidently expects it to be understood (cf. Johnson, GOS LI, p. 50 and note). *Nigoda* (p. xxiv) is simply another name for *sādharaṇa jīva* (see any of the Jain Prakrit lexicons and cf. GOS LI, p. 20).

The text is highly technical and correspondingly difficult to translate. In general the translation has been carefully made, though I would differ on some points. And I think it would have been desirable if references had been given to authoritative original texts rather than to Jaini's *Outlines of Jainism* only. Jaini's English terms (not always the very best) are followed rather too

closely. On the other hand *kāñikṣā* of the *Outlines of Jainism* is incorrectly criticized (p. 19). That is the correct form though its meaning, in Śvetāmbara terminology, at least, is not "desire for worldly objects as a reward for piety," but "acceptance of other doctrines." (See GOS LI, n. 119.) I do not know of any authority for making *doṣa* equivalent to *dveṣa*, nor for making *mohanīya-karman* consist of *moha*, *rāga* and *dveṣa* (p. 27 n.). This is not the usual schematics, and the translator gives no authority for it. The *duṭṭha* of the original (I. 43) is correctly translated "aversion," but this *duṭṭha* is not *duṣṭa*, an error that apparently goes back to the *chāyā* (Amṛtacandra's?), and is presumably responsible for the translator's making *doṣa* the equivalent of *dveṣa* and grouping it with *rāga* and *moha*. The *duṭṭha* of the original is obviously not *duṣṭa* but *dviṣṭa* (see *Pāia-sadda-maharṇavo*, s. v.), which coordinates it properly with *vimūḍha* and *rakṭa*, without violence. In Śvetāmbara usage *moha*, *rāga* and *dveṣa* constitute three *doṣas* (faults), the only connection between *doṣa* and *dveṣa*. The distinction between *bhavya* and *abhavya* (p. 41 n.) is not one of time, but of qualification for "liberation" at all (see GOS LI, n. 3 and references). One wonders why *tridaśādāyo* is translated (p. 46) the "thirty (gods), etc.," instead of merely "gods, etc.," since there is certainly no allusion in Jainism to any original number. "Religious observances" for *saṃiti* (p. 158 and f.) is misleading, I think. *Samiti* is usually translated "carefulness" and the five kinds are well known. They relate to daily practical living. In the translation of III. 8 the six "daily duties" (*āvaśyaka*) are correctly separated from other duties which follow in the text; but in the translation of the commentary (p. 159) these other duties are confused with the *āvaśyakas*. They are entirely different. *Ālocana* (°ā) is the regular term for "confession" and that is certainly the meaning in III. 11-12. I think the translation misses the point here. When a *śramana* commits a fault in spite of his careful conduct, he must confess to a suitable *śramana* and observe a penance prescribed by him.

In common with many of his predecessors and contemporaries Mr. Faddegon translates *sādhū* as "saint," an objectionable term. A *sādhū* is a monk.

Would not the Gopādri of the Praśasti be Girnar rather than Śatruñjaya (p. 216)?

2. This text and translation of the Pravacanasāra appeared very

soon after Faddegon's. To the reader who knows Sanskrit it has the advantage of including the original Prakrit of Kundakunda, the chāyā, the original text of the two Sanskrit commentaries, and a Hindī commentary. The translation is only of the original Prakrit text. So the two translations complement each other.

The text is the one preserved in Jayasena's commentary and, obviously, some of the differences in the two translations are due to differences in the texts from which the translations are made. Prof. Upadhye's translation is not as careful in philological details, but shows more knowledge of the technicalities of Jain doctrine.

The introductory essay is very elaborate and deals with all aspects of Kundakunda's life and works. Prof. Upadhye decides that the weight of evidence is in favor of the "beginning of the Christian era" for Kundakunda's time.

Though this is called a "second edition," the "first" seems to be the edition of Pandit Manoharalal, Bombay, 1912.

HELEN M. JOHNSON.

Osceola, Missouri.

Śrīmad Bhagavadgītā Rahasya or Karma-Yoga-Sāstra. . . . By
BAL GANGADHAR TILAK. . . . Translated [from the original
Marathi] by BHALCHANDRA SITARAM SUKTHANKAR. . . .
Poona: [Tilak Bros.] 1935. 2 vols: lxxx + xlviii + 1210 +
123 pp.

The late author of this work was one of the greatest political leaders of modern India. He was respected, and his sincerity was acknowledged, even by those who disapproved of his aims and methods; and he was idolized by his politically conscious countrymen, to a degree equalled by none in his life-time, and exceeded since then by Mahatma Gandhi alone. He was, too, a Sanskritist of good standing; his scholarly work was known and respected also in the west. Towards the end of his life he employed some periods of enforced idleness in a British prison to write the book which is here for the first time translated into a European tongue. It has gone thru many editions in its native Marathi and in a Hindi version, and translations have likewise appeared in Gujarati, Bengali, Kanarese, Telugu, and Tamil; which shows its popularity in India.

It includes a complete translation of the Gita, with elaborate commentary, verse by verse. But this is only a small part of its bulk. The rest is a comprehensive statement of the author's philosophy, particularly his ethics. It is, in short, a personal apologia. Thruout the whole, the teachings which Tilak found in the Gita are given special prominence; to him the Gita was the greatest of all Bibles, as it is to Gandhi today. But there is a great deal more than that. Tilak was widely read in the religious and philosophical literature of both India and the west (at least such western literature as existed in English versions; how much direct use he made of other European languages is not clear to me). And his keen, inquiring, and reflective mind busied itself with all such materials which came to his attention, using them all to shape his own attitude towards the problems of life. He was intensely practical in all this. Like the genuine Hindu he was, he had none of the European philosopher's interest in "abstract" truth "for its own sake." The supposedly "impractical" Hindus have never cared about knowledge unless they conceived that it would lead to some useful end. It is we who should be called "impractical."

Tilak describes his own practical philosophy as "energism," and, quite correctly, finds it among the cardinal doctrines of the Gita. The Gita preaches, and he practised, the strenuous life, a life of vigorous—albeit disinterested—action. No ascetic withdrawal, no "renunciation"; but also no selfishness, no interest in action's result ("fruit, *phalam*") for oneself. The difficulty with this, as a practical program, seems to me to be that it fails to tell us clearly just what actions to perform. Perhaps, to be sure, it is no worse in this regard than other ethical philosophies; for, as Tilak points out, those which profess to do so usually turn out to be indecisive or unsatisfactory when examined closely. But the positive side of his argument is less convincing than his destructive criticism. The most interesting of all his chapters is the twelfth, in which he struggles manfully with this problem. I wish I could say that I find his answer conclusive. In essence it boils down to this, that the perfected man (*sthitaprajña*) cannot help doing right; any action he performs must be good. For us poor mortals who cannot claim to be *sthitaprajña*, or to know anyone who is, this seems rather cold comfort. For even if (as both the Gita and Tilak advise) we try to follow the model of some *sthitaprajña*, how can we always be sure that our circumstances are quite analogous to

those of our model? History never quite repeats itself, despite the adage; no two human situations are ever exactly identical. To kill evil-doers is right, say the Gita and Tilak; Arjuna must "disinterestedly" fight even his gurus, because they were wrong. But how can I be quite sure that, in this particular fight, I am right and my enemy is wrong, if there happens to be no *sthitaprajña* at hand to assure me? Arjuna had Krishna as his charioteer; he was in luck. Of course I am firmly convinced in my own mind that I am right; but do not people discover afterwards that they have been mistaken? Furthermore, how can one infallibly recognize a *sthitaprajña*? Arjuna himself asks this question in the second chapter of the Gita. The answer seems to Tilak conclusive and final; but who, of men now living, fits the description? Mahatma Gandhi, perhaps? Not according to his own opinion of himself; for he has repeatedly made public confession of errors and imperfections. Who then is to decide for us just what killings, for example, are "right," and what ones are wrong because they violate true *ahimsā*?

The book interests me chiefly as an account of the philosophical and ethical standpoint of a great Indian personality, the "Lokamanya" Tilak. As an interpretation of the Gita, it is, I must say, just—another interpretation of the Gita, neither better nor worse than scores of others, on the whole. Of course it contains much that is sound, penetrating, and illuminating. It could not be otherwise, for Tilak was a most intelligent man, and a good Sanskritist. But no one who has really studied the Gita¹ is ever satisfied with anyone else's interpretation of it. Perhaps this is a high compliment to the book itself, which manages to be more or less "all things to all men." So, just as Tilak differs at many points from each of his predecessors, from Sankara down, I should differ from him at just as many points. A single example may be permitted. It is a passage to which he attributes cardinal importance (see e. g. p. 77), Gita 2. 50, *yogaḥ karmasu kauśalam*. This Tilak regards as the Gita's fundamental definition of the all-important technical term *yoga*. He understands: "Yoga means a special

¹ In no spirit of arrogance, but simply to show that I have really tried to study the Gita, I may say that I have read it with considerable care at least thirty times; have published a book attempting to interpret it; and have prepared a careful complete translation and commentary (as yet unpublished).

device for performing actions." To me this seems, in the context, as implausible as possible. The whole verse reads:

*buddhiyukto jahātīha ubhe suṛtaduḥkṛte
tasmād yogāya yujyasva yogaḥ karmasu kauśalam.*

Which I think means: "He who is disciplined in mental attitude leaves behind in this world both good and evil actions. Therefore discipline thyself unto discipline. Discipline in actions is weal." That is, *karmasu* goes with the preceding, not the following, word; and the latter means "weal, welfare, that which is salutary," not "device." (Note that *karmasu yogaḥ kauśalam* would be metrically impossible.) This is no perverted interpretation of an *anadhikārin* westerner. It goes back to no less a Hindu authority than Śaṅkarācārya. It is Tilak's rendering, in my opinion, that is clearly a perversion of the obvious meaning. Yet on this sandy foundation he bases a great deal of argumentative superstructure.

The translation into English is reasonably satisfactory. At least it seems to make Tilak's meaning clear (I cannot compare it with the original), altho, quite naturally, it is easy to see that English is not the translator's native language. European proper names were, of course, transliterated in the original, and the translator has sometimes contented himself with re-transliteration, with unfortunate results, when the names were unknown to him. Hence such regrettable forms as Laurincer for Lorinser, Lamarque for Lamarck, and Bournouff (or, in the Index, Bournoff) for Burnouf.

FRANKLIN EDGERTON.

Yale University.

The Couling-Chalfant Collection of Inscribed Oracle Bones. Drawn by FRANK H. CHALFANT; edited by ROSWELL S. BRITTON. Shanghai: THE COMMERCIAL PRESS, LTD., 1935. Pp. 132.

According to the brief explanatory preface of the editor "Chalfant's sketch-plates here printed contain his facsimile drawings of 670 mammal bone pieces, 1016 plastron pieces, and one antler, a total of 1687 pieces." The original pieces were purchased by Samuel Couling and Frank Herring Chalfant from dealers at Weihsien, Shantung, during the period of about 1904-1908, and are at present divided among the Royal Scottish Museum, Edinburgh, the British Museum, London, the Carnegie Museum, Pittsburgh, and the Field Museum of Natural History, Chicago.

Dr. Britton has prepared and circulated an *Addendum* (Tokyo, 31 December, 1935) listing sixty specimens as wholly spurious, and twenty-three as partly spurious—in so far, in each case, as their inscriptions are concerned. In this he simply transmits the opinions of Kuo Mo-jo, based solely on examination of the sketches, and specifically stated to be no more than tentative.

The editor has wisely omitted the “many carved pieces,” “so-called amulets,” from his publication. He goes far in boldly stating that they are “now known to be largely forgeries”; perhaps he inserted the word “largely” chiefly as a matter of courtesy. This reviewer will not disregard his example of scholarly caution. But all the objects of this class which I have had the privilege of examining were clearly false; nothing of the kind has ever been excavated at Anyang to my knowledge, and several of the leading Chinese experts in the field have expressed to me the opinion that they are all forged. Some of these inscriptions are even punctuated with little circles!

The genealogical inscriptions on a bone and an antler, numbers C 1506 and C 1989, are considered spurious by Kuo Mo-jo, in my opinion quite rightly. The characters on the latter, of which photographs have been published,¹ look like no other Shang characters I have ever seen. It would be quite convenient, of course, to have prepared tables like these telling us that of the Shang kings “so-and-so’s son was called so-and-so, and his son was called so-and-so,” etc. But against their authenticity, even if they looked genuine, would stand the fact that such inscriptions not only have never been found, to my knowledge, in scientific excavation, but far more important than that, they belong to a category of records which is not represented among the current Shang bone inscriptions.

It is unfortunate, of course, that these are drawings rather than squeezes or photographs. Fundamental research can never be based on such materials. Yet they are far from valueless. This work serves as a catalogue by means of which one may learn what is available, and where it is located, so as to examine the original or obtain facsimiles if necessary. Every complete library on the oracle bones must include it.

HERRLEE GLESSNER CREEL.

The University of Chicago.

¹ See *JRAS* for 1933, opp. p. 672, Plates VI-VIII.

Chinesische Malkunsttheorie in der T'ang- und Sungzeit: Versuch einer geschichtlichen Betrachtung. By KU TENG. Sonderdruck aus der *Ostasiatischen Zeitschrift*, 1935. Pp. 65.

Although painting existed in China long before the Han period, the beginnings of Chinese aesthetic theory are fairly modern. To be sure even in the Chou and Chin periods, there appeared some fragmentary comments on painting, but they are unintentional and purely incidental. Dr. Teng credits Chang Heng of the later Han as the first aesthetician. He writes: "Painters prefer to depict devils rather than dogs and horses, because real objects are difficult while the realm of the unreal is infinite." Here he is restating the view held by his predecessors such as Chuang-tzu, Han Fei (*d.* 233 B. C.), and Huai Nan-tzu (*d.* 122 B. C.). For the beginning of the original view point, one must wait for Ku K'ai-chih, who, according to Dr. Teng, was an idealist and identified the fundamentals of creative art as well as of criticism and appreciation as "Nachempfindung" and "Einfühlung."

The T'ang period was a golden age in the history of painting, for, first, landscape painting now attained a position of independent significance, and second, the Buddhistic painting made itself free from foreign style and established its own. But for the theory of art, we have to wait till we come to the Sung period. It is interesting to note that the poet Tu Fu (712-770) was concerned with the psychology of artistic creation, which he compares with birth or a sudden explosion of force and energy. It is painful, but it is the only means of identifying one's self with nature.

With the close of the T'ang period, painting was freed from moral and ethical bondage. Landscape painting as the "gentleman's" art was given a special honored place, and came to be appreciated for its own sake. Thus it is natural that the theory of painting should concern itself primarily with landscape painting.

The author gives brief resumé's of Ching Hao's *Pi Fa Chi* and Kuo Hsi's *Lin Ch'üan Kao Chih*. These painters were also critics, and above all they were gentleman-painters, who worked, not for a living, but for the joy of painting. On the other hand, there were many real painters who trained themselves in the art and made themselves specialists in the field. Both assiduously cultivated their own style. The former lived among the hills and mists, and communed with nature, while the latter participated in busy court life,

governed by routine and rigid conventions. Especially after 1112, when the Emperor Hui Tsung reformed the Academy of Fine Art, these painters, like the civil officers, had to take a government examination and be trained for the office. These, Dr. Teng calls the Academic mannerists, and they were suspicious of genius and put much emphasis on technical training and mental discipline. The Academic mannerists in regard to the aesthetic theory contributed little, but by their criticism, they did much to awaken a new interest and spirit in the gentleman-painters of the decadent period.

The present study is well documented. The author is well acquainted with Western as well as Japanese scholarship, and as he states in the introduction, he follows in many important points the work of Shogo Kinbara's (misread as S. Kanahara in the text) work. The most disconcerting thing to the reader, however, is the fact that he uses Western terms to explain Chinese concepts. I have already quoted from the author's comment on Ku K'ai-chih, and if any reader identifies "Nachempfindung" with Vernon Lee's "empathy," he no longer is dealing with the Chinese theory of art, but is in 19th century Europe. In the same sense, I strongly object to the use of such words as "reality," "creative energy" or "consciousness," and many others. Especially is one appalled when, for example, Kuo Hsi's statement, "A painter should be master over and not a slave to his brush," is followed by such a comment as, "Hier hat er das Ich betont, das hat auch dei späteren Individualisten beeinflutzt." The work, however, is important as a resumé of the theory of painting of the T'ang and Sung periods.

The Chinese on the Art of Painting: Translations and Comments.

By OSVALD SIRÉN. Peiping: HENRI VETCH, 1936. Pp. 6, 261; 8 plates.

Although Ku Teng minimizes the importance of the Western scholarship in Chinese aesthetics, I feel that a good deal of pioneer work was done by the European scholars who were well equipped with critical tradition. To the students of Chinese art, Osvald Sirén needs no introduction. The present publication is a complement to his *History of Early Chinese Painting* (London, 1933), which has

not as yet been continued beyond the Yüan period. The author has been brought to "a realization that a real acquaintance with the history and significance of Chinese painting must be based on historical records and writings by Chinese critics of the last thousand years rather than on the scanty products of ancient painting that still may be seen." Hence he has gathered together in one handy volume a selection of materials discussing certain fundamental ideas in artistic creation and appreciation. His chief emphasis is centered on the theoretical rather than on the practical side of the problems.

In his brief chapter "the Han to the T'ang Dynasty" the author sums up the various stages in the evolution of the concept of the function of painting. Painting like the art of writing had a divine origin and was a means of symbolic expression. Its moral purpose was to inculcate high ideals. Hsieh Ho who wrote *Ku Hua P'in Lu* at the close of the 5th century laid the general foundation for Chinese art-criticism in his Six Principles. The first principle, *ch'i-yün shêng-tung* (spirit resonance and life movement), with its philosophical implication, became the center of centuries of aesthetic discussion. Chang Yen-yüan devotes a special chapter to it. On the whole this long period was dominated by the Taoist attitude toward aesthetics.

The Sung period is dominated by landscapists and poet-painters, and there developed monochrome ink painting. Hsieh Ho's six principles in painting are modified by Ching Hao in his *Pi Fa Chi* to be applied to this new type of landscape painting. Things, he holds, may be out of reason or out of proportion and yet serve the purpose of the artist, if only they are permeated by the aesthetic vitality which is the secret of the artist's creative mind. The most important contribution of this period, however, is an essay by Kuo Hsi, and to quote the author: "It contains passages of great interest which throw a vivid light on the painter's activity, his ideals and psychological attitude, but these are interspersed with observations on motifs, effects of nature geographic conditions, which have little connection with the aesthetic problems of art." In the review of Ku Teng's work, I have briefly referred to the rise of the gentleman-painter of the Northern Sung period.

Sirén's chapter on "Ch'an Buddhism and Its Relation to Painting" is to me very significant, for he catches that intangible quality of the creed of the Ch'an painters. He writes: "It was no longer

of importance what they represented, whether it was large or small, a whole landscape or only some fruits or flowers, if only it served to transmit some glimpse from a world beyond material limits of time and space like the enlightened mind of the creative master."

The rest of the book is devoted to the critical survey of the Yüan, Ming, and Ch'ing aesthetic theories. There is little original contribution either in theory or observation, but their main importance lies in the biographical and historical field. In general they followed those general principles of appreciation which had occupied so many of the writers on art ever since the fifth century. The author's detailed discussion of the works of Shên Hao and the monk Tao-chi is very enlightening.

Although the book is not at all easy reading, it is very satisfying to the reader, because of (1) its arrangement of the materials, (2) its intelligent selection of both text and illustrations. He does not confine himself to writings on painting, but by a few selections of the historical elements, he gives an excellent intellectual background to each period. Finally, it was very fortunate that the author leaves the Chinese to speak for themselves. He never forces any Western system of thought-pattern or aesthetic terminology to clarify (but really to confuse) vague and strange expressions of the Chinese. Students of Chinese painting must accept these peculiarities and follow willingly fifteen long centuries of unbroken traditionalism.

SHIO SAKANISHI.

Library of Congress.

The Chinese: Their History and Culture. By KENNETH SCOTT LATOURETTE. 2 vols., XIV—506 and 389 pages, 1 map. Second Edition Revised, two volumes in one. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1934.

Professor Latourette's work on the history and culture of the Chinese has received, since its appearance three years ago, well-nigh universal acclaim. He has discharged his task of presenting a comprehensive account of China and the Chinese based in large part upon the monographs of Western scholars in recent decades exceptionally well. As an introductory work for students and as a reference work for the scholar it is indispensable. The select

critical bibliographies at the end of each chapter are especially useful. It fills a great need, as Samuel Wells Williams's work *The Middle Kingdom*, the last really serious work of its kind, received its latest revision as long ago as 1883. Our knowledge of Chinese history and culture has increased considerably since then due to the application of critical historical and archaeological methods in the Chinese field by scores of scholars East and West. A comparison of the two works discloses readily the progress made in Chinese studies in the past fifty years.

That the work has been well received by the public is seen in the appearance of a second edition slightly revised within a year after its publication. Firm in the belief that it will run through more editions the reviewer adds here a few general criticisms and specific corrections or comments which have been noted in the sections of the work which fall within his special fields of interest and research. One general criticism arises from an ordinarily laudable caution which characterizes the author's presentation of his material, namely, that it frequently leads to understatement that robs the work of a forceful and vivacious style. For example, something more definite could have been written with respect to amount of extraterritoriality enjoyed by foreigners than that they had a "certain degree" (Vol. I, p. 364) of it. The ascription of the writing brush to Meng T'ien is more than "probably" (Vol. I, p. 97) not to be trusted. The tradition is without foundation, a writing brush having been discovered which was made prior to Meng T'ien's time.

The following comments relate to the first volume. There were fifteen, not thirteen, provinces in the Ming dynasty (p. 311). The introduction of corn, potatoes, etc. from the New World may well have had a profound influence on the great growth of population which occurred after 1700 (p. 317). Among the reasons for the decline of the admiration of things Chinese in Europe should be mentioned the changed and generally improved conditions in Europe and the revival of Classicism (p. 355). Guy Boulais in his *Manuel du Code Chinois* has given a full translation of the Ch'ing code, Staunton's being only a partial one (p. 358). The increased use of opium in the first part of the nineteenth century not merely "threatened" but actually did reverse China's favorable balance of trade and led to an export of silver (p. 367). Among the reasons for Japan's successful and rapid modernization were the

traditions of loyalty extending beyond the family to the feudal lord and the high regard for the soldier fostered in the feudal organization of the country as contrasted with the strikingly different socio-economic set-up in China (p. 401). The birthday of Sun Yat-sen is unknown—the official date is November 12th (p. 411). He can hardly be characterized as a reformer along with K'ang Yu-wei as he quickly forsook reform for revolutionary tactics after 1895 (p. 412). The best biography of Sun is that by Lyon Sharman, *Sun Yat-Sen—His Life and its Meaning* (New York, 1934). The Diamond Sutra is not the "earliest known printed book" but the earliest *extant* printed work as it is known that a Buddhist work, the Lû Su, was printed twenty or more years earlier (p. 224).

In the second volume (p. 33) it should be observed that China had a body of rules governing inter-state intercourse in the centuries preceding the founding of the Empire. For this see Roswell Britton's article and bibliography, "Chinese Interstate Intercourse Before 700 B. C." (*American Journal of International Law*, Oct. 1935). To the bibliography of books dealing with the government of China under the Ch'ing (p. 62) should be added Brunnert, N. S. and Hagelstrom, V. V., *Present Day Political Organization of China* (Shanghai, 1912). It is fuller than Mayers and covers as well the reforms made at the close of the dynasty. As is so frequently the case in western accounts of divorce in China, which invariably list the seven causes permitting it, the author has failed to list the three cases in which divorce cannot be secured as stipulated in the code and which make its occurrence very rare in Chinese society (p. 189). For the law on this point see G. Boulais, *Manuel du Code Chinois*, Vol. I, p. 301.

In the latest codes the word concubine (*ch'ieh*) does not appear (p. 190). Concubinage is neither forbidden nor is it recognized legally. The law now provides, under laws relating to adultery, that a husband may not take a concubine without the wife's consent and, if he does, it only becomes a criminal offense in the case when a spouse brings complaint. The law is not retroactive.

CYRUS H. PEAKE.

Columbia University.

The Craft of the Japanese Sculptor. By LANGDON WARNER. New York: McFARLANE, WARD, McFARLANE and JAPAN SOCIETY OF NEW YORK. 1936. 55 pp. 85 plates with descriptions.

The novice who is genuinely interested in understanding something of Oriental art, at least enough to wish to enjoy looking at Buddhist sculpture intelligently, will be grateful to Langdon Warner for having given the general public such a book as *The Craft of the Japanese Sculptor*. Just the information and examples needed in beginning to understand the aim and methods, the conditions and ideas, that produced sculpture in Japan from the sixth to the nineteenth century, are to be found in these brief and scintillating pages and in the descriptions of the illuminating examples here reproduced. Though not designed for the student, this book could hardly fail to make the reader wish to become one. It is a birdseye view, but clear and vivid nevertheless.

Though Asiatic art is the art of mental imagery and one must become familiar with Buddhist symbols in order to appreciate its formal use of natural objects to represent abstract ideas, Mr. Warner helps the Western beginner to realize that Buddhist gods are but special aspects of the Absolute—the Whole Truth—and “ought not to be represented as functioning biologically nor conforming to any standards of fleshly beauty.” If we recognize that “lovely humanity can be no symbol for abstract divinity” and that the early Buddhist artist’s aim was perfection rather than imitation of nature or self-expression, then we are ready to see what beauty of their own kind the Buddhist gods possess, as the author points out.

The book is obviously designed for immediate pleasure rather than for teaching, but surely pleasure is no hindrance to teaching and the few hours made pleasant by studying so stimulating a book may serve as a small but sure foundation for a sympathetic understanding of Asiatic culture. We are helped to see what the Japanese sculptor saw, and to get a picture of the historical background and the technical developments which influenced his art, by the concise and exceedingly interesting and intelligible characterization of the different periods of Japanese art in relation to sculpture.

Mr. Warner is to be commended for adhering to the purpose of the book, for focussing on essentials, and for avoiding the usual pitfall of interposing classroom material between artist and beholder.

NOTES OF THE SOCIETY

The following persons, elected by the Society or its Executive Committee, have qualified for membership:

Rev. J. B. Bernardin
John LeRoy Christian
J. W. Creighton
Prof. Ernst Diez
M. W. Dowson
Dr. Paul Hanly Furfey
Albert Gallatin
Sidney D. Gamble
Dr. H. L. Ginsberg
Prof. H. H. Gowen
Douglas G. Haring
Prof. Edward J. Jurji
Dr. J. Alexander Kerns
Dr. S. N. Kramer

Walter H. Mallory
Dr. Mehdi K. Nakosteen
John A. Pope
Dr. Karl Reuning
Horace A. Riggs
Herbert W. Schneider
Henry Lee Smith
Rev. John E. Steinmueller
J. W. Swain
Rev. Joseph Tennant
Bishop H. St. George Tucker
Paul A. Turner
Dean R. Wickes

The following persons, having been elected by the Executive Committee, are expected to qualify shortly:

Lawrence Cohen
Prof. M. F. Farley
Frederick V. Field
Dr. Ross J. Griffith
Dr. Charles A. Hawley
Dr. Samuel L. Haworth
H. Page Hurd
Dr. Ernest R. Lacheman
W. L. Ludlow
Dr. David I. Macht

Walter M. McCracken
Carl A. Meroy
Abraham A. Newman
Prof. J. M. Plumer
Arthur R. Siebens
F. E. Sommer
Miss Maria W. Smith
Russel C. Tuck
C. Martin Wilbur

The following persons have applications for membership pending action by the Executive Committee:

Charles M. Fleischner
Merton B. French
Peter S. Goertz
Dr. Godfrey Goosens
J. Howard Howson

Prof. T. W. Kretschmann
Hardin T. McClelland
Yatuka Minakuchi
Benjamin Schwartz
Joseph K. Yamigawa

NOTES OF OTHER SOCIETIES

The Department of Egyptian and Assyrian Antiquities, of the British Museum sends the following note: Students are requested to note that the present temporary Students' Room will be closed as from Jan. 1st, 1937 for an indefinite period, owing to removal. Notice will be sent of the re-opening of the permanent Students' Room.

Announcement is made of the appearance of Volume V of Prof. Peter Thomsen's *Palästinaliteratur*, covering the years 1925-1934. The first fascicle has now been published. The volume will cover 960 pages. Its publication has been made possible by the cooperation of the Hermann-Guthe Stiftung and the Deutscher Verein zur Erforschung Palästinas, and of the publisher J. C. Hinrichs.

LIST OF MEMBERS

The number placed after the address indicates the year of election.

† Designates members deceased since the annual meeting.

HONORARY MEMBERS

- Prof. ADOLF ERMAN, University of Berlin, Germany. (Peter Lennéstr. 36, Berlin-Dahlem.) 1903.
- Sir GEORGE A. GRIERSON, K.C.I.E., Rathfarnham, Camberley, Surrey, England. Corporate Member, 1889; Honorary, 1905.
- Prof. HEERMANN JACOBI, University of Bonn, Germany. (Niebuhrstrasse 59.) 1909.
- †Prof. C. SNOUCK HURGRONJE, University of Leiden, Netherlands. (Rapenburg 61.) 1914.
- M. FRANCOIS THUREAU-DANGIN, Membre de l'Institut de France, 11 Rue Garancière, VI, Paris, France. 1918.
- Sir ARTHUR EVANS, Ashmolean, Oxford, England. 1919.
- Prof. V. SCHEIL, Membre de l'Institut de France, 4bis Rue du Cherche-Midi, Paris, France. 1920.
- Prof. FREDERICK W. THOMAS, University of Oxford, England. 1920.
- Rév. Père M.-J. LAGRANGE, Ecole archéologique française de Palestine, Jerusalem, Palestine. 1921.
- Prof. MORIZ WINTERNITZ, German University of Prague, Czechoslovakia. (XIX, Cechova 15, Prague.) 1923.
- Prof. PAUL PELLIER, Collège de France, Paris, France. (38 Rue de Varenne, Paris, VIIe.) 1924.
- Sir JOHN MARSHALL, Kt., C.I.E., Litt.D., Taxila, Punjab, India. 1928.
- Sir FLINDERS PETRIE, Kt., D.C.L., University College, London, England. 1928.
- Sir AUREL STEIN, Litt.D., c/o Indian Institute, Oxford, England. 1928.
- Prof. WILHELM GEIGER, München-Neubiberg, Germany. 1929.
- Prof. CARL BROCKELMANN, Dahnstr. 47, Wilhelmsruh, Breslau, Germany. 1931.
- Prof. HEINRICH LÜDERS, University of Berlin, Germany. (Berlin-Charlottenburg, Sybelstr. 19.) 1931.
- Prof. HENRI MASPÉRO, Collège de France, Paris, France. 1931.
- Prof. JACOB WACKERNAGEL, University of Basle, Switzerland. (Gartenstr. 93.) Corporate Member, 1921; Honorary, 1931.
- Prof. MASAHARU ANESAKI, 117 Hakusangaten, Tokyo, Japan. 1934.
- Prof. GEORG STEINDORFF, Prendelstrasse 2, Leipzig, Germany. 1934.
- Prof. D. GUSTAV DALMAN, Universität Griefswald, Griefswald, Germany. 1936.
- Prof. REYNOLD A. NICHOLSON, 12 Harvey Road, Cambridge, England. 1936.
- Prof. LOUIS DE LA VALLÉE POUSSIN, 66 Ave. Molière, Bruxelles, Belgium. 1936.

[Total: 24]

HONORARY ASSOCIATES

- †Field Marshal Viscount ALLENBY, G.C.B., G.C.M.G., Naval and Military Club, London, England. 1922.
 Hon. CHARLES R. CRANE, 655 Park Ave., New York, N. Y. 1921.
 Pres. Emeritus FRANK J. GOODNOW, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md. 1921.
 Hon. CHARLES EVANS HUGHES, Chief Justice, The Supreme Court of the United States, Washington, D. C. 1922.
 Hon. HENRY MORGENTHAU, 417 Park Ave., New York, N. Y. 1921.
 Hon. SAO-KE ALFRED SZE, Chinese Legation, Washington, D. C. 1922.

[Total: 6]

CORPORATE MEMBERS

Names marked with * are those of life members.

- MARCUS AARON, 5564 Aylesboro Ave., Pittsburgh, Pa. 1921.
 Mr. NABIA ABBOTT, 303 Oriental Institute, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois. 1936.
 Miss ADELAIDE A. ADAMS, 715 Forest Ave., Ann Arbor, Mich. 1927.
 Prof. J. MCKEE ADAMS, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Ky. 1932.
 *Pres. CYRUS ADLER (Dropsie College), 2041 North Broad St., Philadelphia, Pa. 1884.
 Dr. MEHMET AGA-OGU, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan. 1930.
 Mr. ALLEN D. ALBERT, JR., Seabury-Western Theological Seminary, Sheridan Road at Haven St., Evanston, Ill. 1932.
 Prof. WILLIAM FOXWELL ALBRIGHT, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md. 1915.
 Prof. EDWIN BROWN ALLEN (Rensselaer Polytechnic Inst.), 4 Sheldon Ave., Troy, N. Y. 1932.
 Prof. T. GEORGE ALLEN (Univ. of Chicago), 5460 Ridgewood Court, Chicago, Ill. 1917.
 Prof. OSWALD T. ALLIS, Westminster Theological Seminary, 1523 Pine St., Philadelphia, Pa. 1916.
 Prof. J. C. ARCHER, Yale Divinity School, 409 Prospect St., New Haven, Conn. 1916.
 Mrs. LOUIS E. ASHER, 5008 Greenwood Ave., Chicago, Ill. 1932.
 Rev. FREDERICK A. ASTON, 690 Riverside Drive, New York, N. Y. 1935.
 Dr. S. D. ATKINS, Baylor University, Waco, Texas. 1936.
 LUDWIG BACHOFER, Ph.D., 1201 E. 60th St., Chicago, Ill. 1936.
 ARNOLD A. BAKE, D.Litt., 38 Lansdowne Crescent, London W 11, England. 1936.
 LOUIS BAMBERGER, c/o L. Bamberger & Co., Newark, N. J. 1928.
 MOSHE BAR-AM, Ph.D., 670 Yale Station, New Haven, Conn. 1936.
 Mrs. EARL H. BARBER, 42 Haven St., Reading, Mass. 1925.
 *PHILIP LEMONT BARBOUR, 212 E. 49th St., New York, N. Y. 1917.
 Prof. SALO BARON, Fayerweather Hall, Columbia Univ., New York, N. Y. 1933.

- *Prof. LEROY CARR BARRET, Trinity College, Hartford, Conn. 1903.
- *Prof. GEORGE A. BARTON (Univ. of Pennsylvania), 4243 Spruce St., Philadelphia, Pa. 1888.
- Mrs. DANIEL M. BATES, 30 Edgmont Ave., Summit, N. J. 1912.
- Prof. MINER SEARLE BATES, University of Nanking, Nanking, China. 1926.
- *Prof. LORING W. BATTEN, 560 Riverview Road, Swarthmore, Pa. 1894.
- GEORGE BECHTEL, 1430 Henry Clay Ave., New Orleans, La. 1935.
- Prof. ALFRED R. BELLINGER (Yale Univ.), 234 Fountain St., New Haven, Conn. 1929.
- *Prof. SHREPAD K. BELVALKAR (Deccan College), Bilvakunja, Bhamburda, Poona, India. 1914.
- †*ALBERT FARWELL BEMIS, 40 Central St., Boston, Mass. 1927.
- Prof. HAROLD H. BENDER, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J. 1906.
- †Prof. C. THEODORE BENZE, D.D. (Lutheran Theol. Seminary), 7304 Boyer St., Mt. Airy, Pa. 1916.
- Rev. W. THEODORE BENZE, New Amsterdam, Berbice, British Guiana. 1933.
- ABRAHAM BERGMAN, American School of Oriental Research, Jerusalem, Palestine. 1933.
- Mr. MOSHE BERKOOZ, 1125 Magnolia Ave., Camden, N. J. 1934.
- Rabbi MORTON M. BERMAN, Jewish Institute of Religion, 40 West 68th St., New York, N. Y. 1929.
- OSCAR BERMAN, Third and Plum Sts., Cincinnati, Ohio. 1920.
- PIERRE A. BERNARD, Clarkstown Country Club, Nyack, N. Y. 1914.
- Mr. THEOS C. BERNARD, 400 E. 57th St., New York, N. Y. 1936.
- Mrs. T. C. BERNARD, 400 E. 57th St., New York, N. Y. 1928.
- Rev. J. BUCHANAN BERNARDIN, Th.D., 251 West 80th St., New York City, N. Y. 1936.
- Dr. RICHARD BERNHEIMER, Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, Pa. 1934.
- Prof. GEORGE R. BERRY, Hamilton, N. Y.
- Prof. D. R. BHANDARKAR (Univ. of Calcutta), 35 Ballygunge Circular Road, Calcutta, India. 1921.
- Mr. WOODBRIDGE BINGHAM, c/o General Delivery, Kyoto, Japan. 1931.
- Mr. CARL W. BISHOP, Freer Gallery of Art, Washington, D. C. 1917.
- Rev. JOHN KINGSLEY BIRGE, Ph.D., Box 142, Istanbul, Turkey. 1934.
- Miss JOYCE BLACK, 22608 Nona Ave., Dearborn, Mich. 1935.
- Miss DOROTHY BLAIR, Assistant Curator, Toledo Museum of Art, Toledo, Ohio. 1931.
- Prof. FRANK RINGGOLD BLAKE (Johns Hopkins Univ.), 2205 Arden Road, Mt. Washington, Baltimore, Md. 1900.
- Rabbi SHELDON H. BLANK, Ph.D., Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, Ohio. 1926.
- Prof. LEONARD BLOOMFIELD, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1927 (1917).
- Prof. PAUL F. BLOOMHARDT, Wittenberg College, Springfield, Ohio. 1916.
- Dr. GEORGE V. BOBBINSKOY, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1925.
- Prof. FRANZ M. T. BÜHL, D.D., Ph.D., University of Leiden, Rapenburg 53, Leiden, Holland. 1928.

- *Prof. GEORGE M. BOLLING (Ohio State Univ.), 777 Franklin Ave., Columbus, Ohio. 1896.
- Prof. CAMPBELL BONNER, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich. 1920.
- PETER A. BOODBERG, Ph.D., 1760 Rose St., Berkeley, Calif. 1933.
- Mr. HUGH BORTON, 19 Prospect Ave., Moorestown, N. J. 1932.
- Dr. RAYMOND A. BOWMAN, 5464 S. Ridgewood Ct., Chicago, Ill. 1931.
- Rev. A. M. BOYER, 114 Rue du Bac, Paris VIIe, France. 1928.
- WATSON BOYES, Oriental Institute, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1928.
- Prof. CHARLES S. BRADEN, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill. 1926.
- Prof. THOMAS A. BRADY, 211 S. William St., Columbia, Mo. 1932.
- Prof. GEORGE WESTON BRIGGS, M.Sc. (Drew University), Green Village Road, Madison, N. J. 1923.
- ROSSELL S. BRITTON, 430 West 118th St., New York, N. Y. 1933.
- Rev. CHARLES D. BROKENSHIRE, Lock Box 56, Alma, Mich. 1917.
- Rev. MITCHELL BRONK, 1703 Chestnut St., Philadelphia, Pa. 1933.
- Prof. BEATRICE ALLARD BROOKS, Western College, Oxford, Ohio. 1919.
- Mrs. MAURICE BROOKS, French Creek, W. Va. 1933.
- Prof. W. NORMAN BROWN, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa. 1916.
- ADOLPH A. BRUX, Ph.D., 5432 Ingleside Ave., Chicago, Ill. 1936.
- *Prof. CARL DARLING BUCK, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. -892.
- Prof. FRANCIS W. BUCKLER, Oberlin Graduate School of Theology, Oberlin, Ohio. 1926.
- Dr. LUDLOW BULL, Associate Curator, Egyptian Dept., Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, N. Y. 1917.
- ALEXANDER H. BULLOCK, State Mutual Building, Worcester, Mass. 1910.
- Prof. MILLAR BURROWS, 409 Prospect St., New Haven, Conn. 1925.
- Rev. ROGER T. BURTON, c/o R. I. Milne, Harts Hill, Whitesboro, N. Y. 1936.
- Prof. ROMAIN BUTIN, Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C. 1915.
- Prof. MOSES BUTTENWIESER, 511 Evanswood Place, Cincinnati, Ohio. 1917.
- Prof. HENRY J. CADBURY, 7 Buckingham Place, Cambridge, Mass. 1914.
- Prof. EDWIN E. CALVERLEY (Kennedy School of Missions), 143 Sigourney St., Hartford, Conn. 1932.
- Dr. GEORGE G. CAMERON, Oriental Institute, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1931.
- Dr. MERIBETH E. CAMERON, Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio. 1935.
- Mrs. DAGNY CARTER, c/o Bankers Trust Co., 501 5th Ave., New York, N. Y. 1933.
- Prof. ROBERT PIECE CASEY, Brown University, Providence, R. I. 1936.
- RALPH M. CHAIT, 600 Madison Ave., New York, N. Y. 1929.
- Miss HELEN B. CHAPIN, Mills College, Calif. 1929.
- Dr. WILLIAM J. CHAPMAN, "Fallowfield," New Boston, Mass. 1922.
- KSHETRESCHANDRA CHATTOPADHYAYA, M.A., Sanskrit Department, The University, Allahabad, U. P., India. 1925.
- Mr. CHAO-TING CHI, 79 Bay 25th St., Brooklyn, N. Y. 1934.

- A. KAIMING CHIU, Ph.D., Chinese-Japanese Library, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. 1934.
- JOHN LEROY CHRISTIAN, M.A., Political Science Dept., Stanford University, Stanford University, California. 1936.
- Prof. WALTER E. CLARK, Kirkland House, Cambridge, Mass. 1906.
- Mr. B. ARMSTRONG CLAYTOR, 1515 S St., N. W., Washington, D. C. 1934.
- Mr. DAVID L. CLENDENIN, 1239 John Jay Hall, Columbia University, New York, N. Y. 1934.
- Rabbi HENRY COHEN, D.D., 1920 Broadway, Galveston, Texas. 1920.
- Miss CATHERINE COOK, 149 E. Huron St., Chicago, Ill. 1935.
- Dr. ANANDA K. COOMARASWAMY, Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, Mass. 1917.
- *Prof. DOUGLAS HILARY CORLEY (Univ. of Louisville), 2304 Wetstein Ave., Louisville, Ky. 1922.
- Sir J. C. COYAJEE (Presidency College), c/o Park St. Branch, Imperial Bank of India, Calcutta, India. 1928.
- Mr. DOUGLAS D. CARY, 503 Church St., Ann Arbor, Mich. 1935.
- Dr. HERLEEE GLESSNER CREEL, Department of History, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1932.
- President JOHN WALLIS CREIGHTON, Hastings College, Hastings, Nebraska. 1936.
- Prof. EARLE B. CROSS, Colgate-Rochester Divinity School, Rochester, N. Y. 1927.
- Miss DEEOTHY CROSS, University Museum, 33d and Spruce Sts., Philadelphia, Pa. 1935.
- Prof. CHARLES GORDON CUMMING (Bangor Theol. Seminary), 353 Hammond St., Bangor, Maine. 1928.
- Miss CECILIA CUTTS (Univ. of Washington), 6011 31st Ave., N. E., Seattle, Wash. 1926.
- Rev. Prof. GEORGE DAHL, Ph.D., 209 Livingston St., New Haven, Conn. 1936.
- *RUSTOM D. DALAL, 1 New Marine Lines, Bombay, India. 1933.
- Dr. D. S. DAVIDSON, Department of Anthropology, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa. 1935.
- Prof. ISRAEL DAVIDSON (Jewish Theol. Seminary), 92 Morningside Ave., New York, N. Y. 1921.
- Dr. NELSON C. DEBEVOISE, 5521 Kimbark Ave., Chicago, Ill. 1927.
- Dean IRWIN HOOE DELONG (Theol. Seminary of the Reformed Church), 523 West James St., Lancaster, Pa. 1916.
- Prof. ROBERT E. DENGLE (Pennsylvania State College), 210 South Gill St., State College, Pa. 1920.
- A. SANDERS DEWITT, M.D., 4854 Third Ave., Detroit, Mich. 1930.
- Mrs. A. SANDERS DEWITT, 4854 Third Ave., Detroit, Mich. 1928.
- Dr. ERNST DIEZ, Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, Pa. 1936.
- Prof. ALOYS HERMAN DIRKSEN, St. Charles Seminary, Carthagena, Ohio. 1933.
- Pres. BAYARD DODGE, American University of Beirut, Beirut, Syria. 1926.
- Rev. DWIGHT M. DONALDSON, Ph.D., D.D., Meshed, Persia. 1928.
- Prof. GEORGES DOSSIN (Univ. of Liège), 20 Rue des Ecoles, Wandre-lez-Liège, Belgium. 1926.

- Mr. M. W. DOWSON, Kut es Sayyid Estate, Basrah, Iraq. 1936.
Prof. LUCY DRISCOLL (Univ. of Chicago), 2564 E. 72nd Place, Chicago, Ill. 1932.
WALDO H. DUBBERSTEIN, Oriental Institute, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1932.
Prof. HOMER H. DUBS, Ph.D., 1717 Kilbourne Place, N. W., Washington, D. C. 1934.
Prof. PAUL EMILE DUMONT, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md. 1930.
Prof. GEORGE S. DUNOAN (American Univ., Y. M. C. A. School of Religion), 2900 Seventh St., N. E., Washington, D. C. 1917.
DOWS DUNHAM, Assistant Curator, Egyptian Dept., Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, Mass. 1929.
Mr. ISIDORE DYEN, 3025 W. Berks St., Philadelphia, Pa. 1936.
Mr. HAMILTON EAMES, 2472 Kenilworth Road, Cleveland Heights, Cleveland, Ohio. 1934.
Miss ELIZABETH S. EATON, Department of Egyptian Art, Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, Mass. 1936.
Prof. FRANKLIN EDGERTON (Yale Univ.), 1504A Yale Station, New Haven, Conn. 1910.
Prof. WILLIAM F. EDGERTON, Oriental Institute, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1917.
Dean GRANVILLE D. EDWARDS (Bible College of Missouri), 811 College Ave., Columbia, Mo. 1917.
Dr. FREDERICK S. EISELEN, 740 Rush St., Chicago, Ill. 1901.
Dr. ISRAEL ETAN, 5880 Northumberland St., Pittsburgh, Pa. 1928.
Prof. SERGE ELISSÉEF, Apartment 304, 992 Memorial Drive, Cambridge, Mass. 1934.
ABRAM I. ELKUS, 40 Wall St., New York, N. Y. 1921.
†Rev. Dr. BARNETT E. ELZAS, 42 West 72d St., New York, N. Y. 1923.
Dr. MURRAY B. EMENEAU (Yale Univ.), 1910 Yale Station, New Haven, Conn. 1929.
Mr. ROBERT M. ENGBERG, 5430 Kimbark Ave., Chicago, Ill. 1935.
Prof. THOMAS EDSON ENNIS, West Virginia University, Morgantown, W. Va. 1932.
Prof. MORTON SCOTT ENSLIN (Crozer Theol. Seminary), 4 Seminary Ave., Chester, Pa. 1925.
Mr. K. C. EVANS, Trinity College, Toronto, Ont., Canada. 1936.
Mrs. EDWARD WARREN EVERETT, Swan House, Hinsdale, Ill. 1930.
NABITH AMIN FARIS, Ph.D., Graduate College, Princeton, New Jersey. 1935.
Dr. SAMUEL FEIGIN, c/o Oriental Institute, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1924.
Dr. EVA FIESEL, Bryn Mawr, Pa. 1936.
Dr. S. FIELDMAN, Dept. of Psychology, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y. 1926.
Miss HELEN E. FERNALD, 707 E. Concord Ave., Orlando, Pa. 1927.
HENRY FIELD, LL.D., Field Museum of Natural History, Chicago, Ill. 1929.
Dr. SOLOMON B. FINESINGER, Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, Ohio. 1922.

- Dr. JOSHUA FINKEL, 3505 Ave. I, Brooklyn, N. Y. 1929.
- Prof. LOUIS FINKELSTEIN, Jewish Theological Seminary, 531 W. 123rd St., New York, N. Y. 1921.
- C. P. FITZGERALD, Saville Club, 69 Brook St., London W., England. 1933.
- Mrs. JULIE MICHELET FOGELBERG, Glen St. Mary, Fla. 1931.
- Rabbi JEROME D. FOLKMAN, 800 3rd St., Jackson, Mich. 1935.
- *MAYNARD DAUCHY FOLLIN, 402 Hammond Bldg., Detroit, Mich. 1922.
- Rev. WILLIAM M. FOUTS, Th.D., 3040 W. Washington Boulevard, Station D, Chicago, Ill. 1929.
- Prof. HENRY T. FOWLER, Brown University, Providence, R. I. 1926.
- Rabbi GRESHAM GEORGE FOX, Ph.D., 7524 Essex Ave., Chicago, Ill. 1924.
- *Prof. JAMES EVERETT FRAME, Union Theological Seminary, Broadway and 120th St., New York, N. Y. 1892.
- Prof. HENRI FRANKFORT, Ph.D., 7 Cannon Place, London N. W. 3, England. 1936.
- Rabbi SOLOMON B. FREEHOF, D.D., Hotel Ruskin, Pittsburgh, Pa. 1918.
- Prof. ALEXANDER FREYMAN, Ph.D. (Univ. of Leningrad), Zwerinskaya 40, Leningrad, U. S. S. R. 1928.
- ALLAN H. FRY, Ph.D., 361 Nassau St., Princeton, N. J. 1935.
- †Prof. LESLIE ELMER FULLER, Garrett Biblical Institute, Evanston, Ill. 1916.
- Prof. KEMPER FULLERTON, Oberlin Graduate School of Theology, Oberlin, Ohio. 1916.
- Prof. PAUL HANLY FURFEY, Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C. 1936.
- *Prof. A. B. GAJENDRAGADKAR, Elphinstone College, Bombay, India. 1921.
- Prof. ESSON M. GALE, Chinese Salt Revenue Administration, 18 The Bund, Shanghai, China. 1929.
- Mr. ALBERT GALLATIN, 7 East 67 St., New York City, N. Y. 1936.
- Dr. SIDNEY D. GAMBLE, 4730 Fieldstone Rd., New York City, N. Y. 1936.
- CHARLES S. GARDNER, 148 Highland Ave., Newtonville, Mass. 1930.
- Miss GUSSIE E. GASKILL, Cornell University Library, Ithaca, N. Y. 1933.
- Miss MARY JEAN GATES, Ph.D., Department of Orientalia, Library of Congress, Washington, D. C. 1934.
- Prof. FRANK GAVIN, General Theological Seminary, Chelsea Square, New York, N. Y. 1917.
- Dr. F. W. GEERS, Oriental Institute, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1928.
- Dr. HENRY SNYDER GEHMAN, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J. 1916.
- Dr. I. J. GELB, Oriental Institute, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1933.
- EUGENE A. GELLOT, 149-46 117th St., Aqueduct, L. I., N. Y. 1911.
- Prof. KATY BARD GEORGE, Wellesley College, Wellesley, Mass. 1936.
- Miss ELIZABETH GERHART, 2 Highland Ave., Madison, N. C. 1934.
- Mrs. JOHN B. GILFILLAN, 222 Clifton Ave., Minneapolis, Minn. 1933.
- Mrs. ALICE COLLENS GLEESON, 52 Barnes St., Providence, R. I. 1934.
- Mr. HAROLD W. GLIDDEN, 178 Graduate College, Princeton, N. J. 1936.
- Rabbi NELSON GLUECK, Ph.D., 162 Glenmary Ave., Clifton, Cincinnati, Ohio. 1929.

- Rabbi SOLOMON GOLDMAN, c/o Anshe Emes Congregation, 3762 Pine Grove Ave., Chicago, Ill. 1920.
- L. CAERINGTON GOODRICH, Dept. of Chinese, Columbia University, New York, N. Y. 1929.
- Rev. Dr. FRED FIELD GOODSELL, 14 Beacon St., Boston, Mass. 1931.
- Dr. CYRUS H. GORDON, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md. 1928.
- †*Prof. RICHARD J. H. GOTTHEIL, Columbia University, New York, N. Y. 1886.
- ALBRECHT GÖTZE, Ph.D., 306 Hall of Graduate Studies, Yale Station, New Haven, Conn. 1935.
- Mr. H. H. GOWEN, 5005 2nd Ave., N. E., Seattle, Washington. 1936.
- Rev. DAVID C. GRAHAM, Ph.D., West China Union University, Chengtu, Szechuan Prov., China. 1931.
- Prof. WILLIAM CREIGHTON GRAHAM, Box 2, Faculty Exchange, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1921.
- Prof. ELIHU GRANT, Haverford College, Haverford, Pa. 1907.
- Dean FREDERICK C. GRANT (Western Theol. Seminary), 600 Haven St., Evanston, Ill. 1929.
- MORTIMER GRAVES, Assistant Secretary, American Council of Learned Societies, 907 Fifteenth St., Washington, D. C. 1929.
- Mr. ROGER SHERMAN GREENE, 71 Lancaster St., Worcester, Mass. 1926.
- *Dr. LUCIA C. GRIEVE, 50 Heck Ave., Ocean Grove, N. J. 1894.
- Rev. Dr. HERVEY D. GRISWOLD, 136 Coeyman Ave., Nutley, N. J. 1920.
- MICHAEL J. GRUENTHNER, St. Mary's College, St. Mary's, Kans. 1929.
- Prof. LÉON GREY (Université libre d'Angers), 10 Rue La Fontaine, Angers, M.-et-L., France. 1921.
- *Dr. GEORGE C. O. HAAS (Inst. of Hyperphysical Research), 45-60 215th Place, Bayside, N. Y. 1903.
- Rabbi RALPH A. HABAS, Ph.D., N. Y. Ethical Society, 2 W. 64th St., New York, N. Y. 1935.
- Miss LOUISE W. HACKNEY, The National Arts Club, 15 Grammercy Park, New York, N. Y. 1932.
- Prof. E. ADELAIDE HAHN, 640 Riverside Drive, New York, N. Y. 1934.
- ABRAHAM S. HALKIN, 1521 Sheridan Ave., New York, N. Y. 1927.
- Miss ARDELLA RIPLEY HALL, Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, Mass. 1934.
- Miss HELEN BENEDICT HALL, 1036 Oakland Ave., Ann Arbor, Mich. 1935.
- Prof. ROBERT B. HALL, Department of Geography, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich. 1934.
- RICHARD T. HALLOCK, Oriental Institute, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1932.
- Prof. CLARENCE H. HAMILTON (Oberlin School of Theology), 144 Forest St., Oberlin, Ohio. 1926.
- Dr. E. S. CRAIGHILL HANDY, Box 38, Hall of Graduate Studies, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. 1924.
- *Rev. EDWARD ROCHE HARDY, JR., Ph.D., General Theological Seminary, 175 Ninth Ave., New York, N. Y. 1924.
- Mr. ROBERT S. HARDY, Hitchcock Hall, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1934.

- Prof. DOUGLAS G. HARING, 117 Euclid Terrace, Syracuse, N. Y. 1936.
- Pres. FRANKLIN STEWART HARRIS, Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah. 1929.
- ZELIG S. HARRIS (Univ. of Pennsylvania), 5601 W. Diamond St., Philadelphia, Pa. 1931.
- Rev. MAX H. HARRISON, Ph.D., 5821 Maryland Ave., Chicago, Ill. 1927.
- HENRY H. HART, J.D., 308 Locust St., San Francisco, California. 1926.
- Mr. JOHN D. HATCH, JR., 60 E. 42nd St., New York, N. Y. 1933.
- Prof. WILLIAM H. P. HATCH, D.D., Th.D. (Episcopal Theol. School), 6 St. John's Road, Cambridge, Mass. 1930.
- Prof. RAYMOND S. HAUPERT, 1310 Main St., Bethlehem, Pa. 1926.
- WILLIAM C. HAYES, Ph.D., Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, N. Y. 1936.
- Mr. WYNDHAM HAYWARD, Lakemont Gardens, Route 1, Winter Park, Fla. 1925.
- Rev. GEORGE P. HEDLEY, Th.D., Box 32, Station A, Berkeley, Calif. 1931.
- N. M. HEERAMANEEK, 724 Fifth Ave., New York, N. Y. 1931.
- Rev. HENRY HERAS, Indian Historical Research Institute, St. Xavier's College, Bombay, India. 1934.
- Rev. DAVID SCUDDER HERRICK, M.A., 138 Hancock St., Auburndale, Mass. 1932.
- ABRAHAM J. HEERTZ, D.D.S., 150 W. 82nd St., New York, N. Y. 1933.
- Prof. WILLIAM BANCROFT HILL, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y. 1921.
- Prof. PHILIP K. HINTI (Princeton University), 106 FitzRandolph Road, Princeton, N. J. 1915.
- Prof. LEWIS HODOUS (Hartford Seminary Foundation), 92 Sherman St., Hartford, Conn. 1919.
- Mr. HOWARD C. HOLLIS, Museum of Art, Cleveland, Ohio. 1936.
- Prof. CLARK HOPKINS, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich. 1931.
- Dr. WILLIAM WOODWARD HORNELL, Vice-Chancellor, Hong-Kong University, Hong-Kong, China. 1928.
- Mr. ISRAEL HORWITZ, Dropsie College, Broad and York Sts., Philadelphia, Pa. 1934.
- Mrs. LYNN HAROLD HOUGH, Drew Forest, Madison, N. J. 1932.
- Prof. HERBERT PIERREPONT HOUGHTON, Carleton College, Northfield, Minn. 1925.
- Prof. FELIX HOWLAND, Habibia College, Kabul, Afghanistan. 1935.
- Rev. QUENTIN K. Y. HUANG, American Church Mission, Nanchang, Kiangsi, China. 1927.
- Miss ISABEL HUBBARD, 715 Forest Ave., Ann Arbor, Mich. 1935.
- Mr. PAUL E. HUFFMAN, 1948 W. North Ave., Baltimore, Md. 1936.
- Mr. GEORGE R. HUGGESS, Oriental Institute, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.
- Pres. EDWARD H. HUME, Yale in China, 905A Yale Station, New Haven, Conn.
- Prof. ROBERT ERNEST HUME (Union Theol. Seminary), 606 West 122nd St., New York, N. Y. 1914.
- WILSON M. HUME, Ph.D., Student Secretary, Y. M. C. A., Lahore, India. 1935.

- Dr. ARTHUR W. HUMMEL, Chinese Collection, Library of Congress, Washington, D. C. 1928.
- WILLIAM F. HUMMEL, Ph.D., 2112 S. Hillcrest St., Los Angeles, Calif. 1932.
- Miss FRANCES E. HUMPEREY, 8328 S. Morgan St., Chicago, Ill. 1932.
- *Dr. ARCHER M. HUNTINGTON, 3 East 89th St., New York, N. Y. 1912.
- The Rt. Rev. D. T. HUNTINGTON, D.D., 281 Fourth Ave., New York, N. Y. 1933.
- Prof. ISAAC HUSIK, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa. 1916.
- Prof. MARY INDA HUSSEY, Mt. Holyoke College, South Hadley, Mass. 1901.
- Prof. J. PHILIP HYATT, Wellesley College, Wellesley, Mass. 1936.
- *JAMES HAZEN HYDE, 67 Boulevard Lannes, Paris, France. 1909.
- *Prof. HENRY HYVERNAT (Catholic Univ. of America), 3405 Twelfth St., N. E. (Brookland), Washington, D. C. 1889.
- Prof. W. A. IRWIN, Oriental Institute, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1927.
- *Prof. A. V. WILLIAMS JACKSON, Columbia University, New York, N. Y. 1885.
- *Mrs. A. V. WILLIAMS JACKSON, c/o Columbia University, New York, N. Y. 1912.
- Mr. HAROLD W. JACOBSON, 5243 N. Christiana Ave., Chicago, Ill. 1935.
- Sir DON BARON JAYATILAKA, M.A., Islington, Havelock Road, Colombo, Ceylon. 1928.
- HORACE H. F. JAYNE (Univ. of Pennsylvania Museum), Memorial Hall, Fairmount Park, Philadelphia, Pa. 1930.
- Rev. Prof. ARTHUR JEFFREY, American University, 113 Sharia Kasr el Aini, Cairo, Egypt. 1923.
- *Prof. JAMES RICHARD JEWETT, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. 1887.
- *Dr. HELEN M. JOHNSON, Osceola, Missouri. 1921.
- HIRAM K. JOHNSON, M.D., Rockland State Hospital, Orangeburg, N. Y. 1932.
- JOTHAM JOHNSON, Ph.D., University Museum, Philadelphia, Pa. 1935.
- Capt. SAMUEL JOHNSON, P. O. Box 611, Jerusalem, Palestine. 1928.
- Sir REGINALD F. JOHNSTON, Kilmartin, Lochgilphead, Scotland. 1919.
- Mrs. SHERMAN E. JOHNSON, Nashotah House, Nashotah, Wisconsin. 1928.
- Rev. SHERMAN E. JOHNSON, Nashotah House, Nashotah, Wisconsin. 1935.
- Prof. S. L. JOSHI, International House, 1414 East 59th St., Chicago, Ill. 1927.
- Dr. EDWARD JABRA JURJI, 75 Harrison St., Princeton, N. J. 1936.
- Mr. ALBERT E. KANE, 817 West End Ave., New York, N. Y. 1934.
- Rev. Dr. CLARENCE E. KEISER, Lyon Station, Pa. 1913.
- CHARLES PENROSE KEITH, Litt.D., 5219 Germantown Ave., Philadelphia, Pa. 1929.
- CARL T. KELLER, 80 Federal St., Boston, Mass. 1928.
- Prof. FREDERICK T. KELLY (Univ. of Wisconsin), 2019 Monroe St., Madison, Wis. 1917.
- EASTON T. KELSEY, Department of State, Washington, D. C. 1930.

- Pres. JAMES A. KELSO, Western Theological Seminary, 731 Ridge Ave., Pittsburgh, Pa. 1915.
- Prof. JAMES L. KELSO, D.D. (Pittsburgh-Xenia Theol. Seminary), 616 W. North Ave., Pittsburgh, Pa. 1921.
- *Prof. ELIZA H. KENDRICK, Wellesley College, Wellesley, Mass. 1896.
- Mr. GEORGE A. KENNEDY, 318 Hall of Graduate Studies, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. 1935.
- Prof. ROLAND G. KENT, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa. 1910.
- Prof. ANDREW KEOGH (Yale Univ.), 49 Huntington St., New Haven, Conn. 1925.
- Mr. J. A. KERNS, New York University, Washington Square, New York, N. Y. 1938.
- H. KEVORKIAN, 24 East 81st St., New York, N. Y. 1927.
- Prof. ANIS E. KHURI, American University of Beirut, Beirut, Syria. 1921.
- Mr. EUGENE KLEIN, 200 S. 13th St., Philadelphia, Pa. 1920.
- Rev. WALTER KLEIN, D.S.T., Morristown School, Morristown, N. J. 1932.
- Prof. CARL S. KNOFF (Univ. of Southern California), Box 33, 3551 University Ave., Los Angeles, Calif. 1929.
- Rev. Dr. RAYMOND C. KNOX, Columbia University, New York, N. Y. 1928.
- Prof. CARL H. KRAELING (Yale Univ.), 67 Ridgewood Ave., New Haven, Conn. 1925.
- Prof. EMIL G. H. KRAELING (Union Theol. Seminary), 531 East 18th St., Brooklyn, N. Y. 1920.
- Mr. CHARLES F. KRAFT, 5800 Maryland Ave., Chicago, Ill. 1934.
- Dr. S. N. KRAMER, Oriental Institute, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1936.
- Mr. HAROUTIUN KURDIAN, 1308 E. Douglas Ave., Wichita, Kansas. 1934.
- Mr. KENNETH PERRY LANDON, Trang, Siam. 1932.
- *Prof. CHARLES ROCKWELL LANMAN (Harvard Univ.), 9 Farrar St., Cambridge, Mass. 1876.
- AMBROSE LANSING, Associate Curator, Egyptian Dept., Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, N. Y. 1921.
- Mr. EMMANUEL S. LARSEN, Room 2722, Navy Dept., Washington, D. C. 1935.
- Prof. KENNETH S. LATOURETTE, Yale Divinity School, 409 Prospect St., New Haven, Conn. 1917.
- Dr. BIMALA C. LAW, 43 Kailas Bose St., Calcutta, India. 1926.
- Mr. SIMON LAZARUS, c/o Professor J. Morgenstern, Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, Ohio. 1921.
- Prof. SHAO CHANG LEE, University of Hawaii, Honolulu, Hawaii. 1928.
- Prof. KURT F. LEIDECCKER, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, Troy, N. Y. 1928.
- FREDERICK LENT, Ph.D., D.D., LL.D., 64 S. Munn Ave., East Orange, N. J. 1935.
- Prof. JULIUS LEWY, 420 Kasota St., Cincinnati, O. 1935.
- Dr. ETHEL J. LINDGREN, Sunbourn, Harston, Cambridge, England. 1928.
- Miss EDA W. LINDQUIST, R. F. D. 2, Claremont, N. H. 1936.
- Prof. ENNO LITTMANN, Ph.D., D.D. (Univ. of Tübingen), 50 Waldhäuserstr., Tübingen, Germany. 1927 (1902).

- Capt. MORRIS U. LIVELY, 1035 Bewick St., Fort Worth, Texas. 1931.
- JOHN ELLERTON LODGE, Freer Gallery of Art, Washington, D. C. 1922.
- Prof. HENRY F. LUTZ (University of California), 1147 Spruce St., Berkeley, Calif. 1916.
- Prof. ALBERT HOWE LYBYER (Univ. of Illinois), 808 S. Lincoln Ave., Urbana, Ill. 1917 (1909).
- Rev. WILLIAM H. McCLELLAN, S.J., Woodstock College, Woodstock, Md. 1922.
- ROBERT H. McCORD, 111 W. 17th St., Upland, Calif. 1933.
- Prof. CHESTER CHARLTON McCOWN, D.D., Pacific School of Religion, Berkeley, Calif. 1920.
- Mr. DONALD E. McCOWN, c/o Miss D. Beatrice McCOWN, 7 Stanley Crescent, London W 11, England. 1934.
- Mr. WILLIAM S. McCULLOUGH, University College, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ont., Canada. 1935.
- *Prof. DUNCAN B. MACDONALD, Hartford Theological Seminary, Hartford, Conn. 1893.
- ROBERT H. McDOWELL, 4016 The Museums Building, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich. 1932.
- Prof. WILLIAM MONTGOMERY MCGOVERN, 105 Harris Hall, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill. 1928.
- Rev. WALLACE H. McLAUGHLIN, Concordia Seminary, Hankow, China. 1936.
- Mr. J. ARTHUR MACLEAN, 2274 Parkwood Ave., Toledo, Ohio. 1922.
- Prof. HARLEY F. MACNAIR, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1929.
- Rev. ALLAN A. MACRAE, Westminster Theological Seminary, 1528 Pine St., Philadelphia, Pa. 1931.
- *Prof. HERBERT W. MAGOUN, 89 Hillcrest Road, Belmont, Mass. 1887.
- Prof. WALTER ARTHUR MAIER (Lutheran Theol. Seminary), 801 DeMun Ave., St. Louis, Mo. 1917.
- Prof. CARROLL B. MALONE, Colorado College, Colorado Springs, Colo. 1929.
- Mr. WALTER H. MALLORY, Executive Director, Council on Foreign Relations, 45 East 65 St., New York City, N. Y. 1938.
- *Rev. Prof. JAMES CAMPBELL MANRY, Allahabad Christian College, Allahabad, India. 1921.
- Prof. A. V. MARAKUEFF, 23 Kitaiskaya St., Vladivostock, U. S. S. R. 1934.
- Prof. RALPH MARCUS, 533 W. 112th St., New York, N. Y. 1920.
- Rabbi ELIAS MARGOLIS, Ph.D., 16 Glen Ave., Mount Vernon, N. Y. 1924.
- JAMES P. MARSH, M.D., 12 Whitman Court, Troy, N. Y. 1919.
- THOMAS E. MARSTON, Etterby Farm, Cornwall, Conn. 1931.
- Mr. RICHARD A. MARTIN, Field Museum, Chicago, Ill. 1936.
- Prof. ALEXANDER MARX, Jewish Theological Seminary, Broadway and 122nd St., New York, N. Y. 1926.
- Prof. MANMOHAN LAL MATHUR, Hindu Sabha College, Amritsar, New Delhi, India. 1927.
- Prof. CHARLES D. MATTHEWS, Birmingham-Southern College, Birmingham, Ala. 1928 (1934).

- Prof. ISAAC G. MATTHEWS, Crozer Theological Seminary, Chester, Pa. 1921 (1906).
- HERBERT G. MAY, Ph.D., Graduate School of Theology, Oberlin, Ohio. 1935.
- Rabbi HARRY H. MAYER, 3512 Kenwood Ave., Kansas City, Mo. 1921.
- Prof. L. A. MAYER, Ph.D., Hebrew University, P. O. Box 613, Jerusalem, Palestine. 1935.
- Prof. THEOPHILE J. MEEK, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ont., Canada. 1917.
- I. MENDELSON, Ph.D., Columbia University Library, Box 1, New York City, N. Y. 1935.
- Rev. JAMES M. MENZIES, Cheeloo University, Tsinan, Shantung, China. 1930.
- Prof. SAMUEL A. B. MERCER, Grafton, Mass. 1912.
- Mrs. BESSIE C. MERRILL, 4 Bryant St., Cambridge, Mass. 1932.
- Mrs. EUGENE MEYER, 1624 Crescent Place, N. W., Washington, D. C. 1916.
- Miss LESLA MICHEL, 1521 Spruce St., Philadelphia, Pa. 1936.
- Prof. TRUMAN MICHELSON (George Washington Univ.), Bureau of American Ethnology, Washington, D. C. 1899.
- Mr. JOSEPH LUDWIG MIHELIC, Oberlin Graduate School of Theology, Oberlin, Ohio. 1936.
- Mr. MERTON L. MILLER, 1800 Victoria Ave., Los Angeles, Calif. 1921.
- Mrs. PHILIP MILLER (*née* Lowden), 5801 Dorchester Ave., Chicago, Ill. 1931.
- A. MINGANA, "Manuscripta," 163 Middleton Hall Road, King's Norton, Birmingham, England. 1923.
- Dr. ROBERT LUDWIG MOND, 10 Cavendish Square, London W. 1, England. 1921.
- KENNETH M. MONROE, Th.D., Ashland Theological Seminary, Ashland, Ohio. 1934.
- Prof. J. A. MONTGOMERY (Univ. of Pennsylvania), 6806 Greene St., Germantown, Philadelphia, Pa. 1903.
- ROBERT N. MONTGOMERY, D.D., Muskingum College, New Concord, Ohio. 1936.
- Mr. LEWIS C. MOON, 409 Prospect St., New Haven, Conn. 1925.
- Mrs. WILLIAM E. MOORE, 4 E. 54th St., New York, N. Y. 1933.
- Pres. JULIAN MORGENSTERN (Hebrew Union College), 8 Burton Woods Lane, Cincinnati, Ohio. 1915.
- *EFFINGHAM B. MORRIS, LL.D., "Tyn-y-Coed," Ardmore, Pa. 1920.
- Rev. RALPH MORTENSEN, Ph.D., Lutheran Board of Publication, 23 Liang Yi St., Hankow, China. 1928.
- Prof. VALENTIN K. MULLER, Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, Pa. 1931.
- Prof. TOYOZO W. NAKARAI, College of Religion, Butler University, Indianapolis, Ind. 1926.
- Dr. MEHDI K. NAKOSTEEN, 61 Sherman St., Denver, Colo. 1936.
- EDWARD I. NATHAN, American Consulate, Monterrey, Mexico. 1928.
- Prof. HAROLD H. NELSON (Univ. of Chicago), Chicago House, Luxor, Egypt. 1928.
- EDWARD THEODORE NEWELL, American Numismatic Society, 156th St. and Broadway, New York, N. Y. 1914.

- Rev. PAUL S. NEWEX, 2501 N. Racine Ave., Chicago, Ill. 1934.
- Mr. HORACE J. NICKELS, Colgate University, Hamilton, N. Y. 1932.
- CHARLES F. NIMS, The Oriental Institute, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1931.
- Mr. HALVERN LAMAR NORRIS, American Vice Consul, Bangkok, Siam. 1935.
- Dr. ALOIS RICHARD NYKL, Karlsbad-Drahowitz, Helferstrasse, Czechoslovakia. 1922.
- Prof. H. TH. OBBINK, D.D. (Univ. of Utrecht), Dillenburgstr. 29, Utrecht, Holland. 1928.
- Prof. JULIAN J. OBERMANN, 215 Hall of Graduate Studies, Yale Univ., New Haven, Conn. 1923.
- ADOLPH S. OCHS, The New York Times, New York, N. Y. 1921.
- *Dr. CHARLES J. OGDEN, 628 West 114th St., New York, N. Y. 1906.
- Prof. ALBERT TENEYCK OLMSTEAD, Oriental Institute, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1909.
- Miss CLETA M. OLMSTEAD, c/o Thomas Cook and Son, Baghdad, Persia. 1938.
- Rev. RAYMOND M. O'PRAY, Woodstock College, Woodstock, Md. 1936.
- Mr. HARRY MEYER ORLINSKY, c/o Dropsie College, Philadelphia, Pa. 1934.
- Miss SUSAN W. ORVIS, Graduate School of Theology, Oberlin, Ohio. 1936.
- Prof. CHARLES A. OWEN, 618 S. 2nd Ave., Washington, Iowa. 1921.
- Mr. ROBERT TREAT PAINE, JR., 16 Ash St., Cambridge, Mass. 1935.
- ELEANOR PARRY, M.D., Peabody House, 357 Charles St., Boston, Mass. 1931.
- ROBERT LEET PATTERSON, 1703 Oliver Bldg., Pittsburgh, Pa. 1920.
- Mrs. KATHERINE HAZELTINE PATON, Horton House, Wellesley, Mass. 1934.
- Pres. CHARLES T. PAUL, 108 Kenyon St., Hartford, Conn. 1920.
- Mr. ANTHONY F. PAURA, 302 W. 46th St., New York, N. Y. 1929.
- Dr. CYRUS H. PEAKE, Department of Chinese, Columbia University, New York, N. Y. 1930.
- Dr. FREELAND F. PENNEY, c/o Rabenold and Scribner, 20 Exchange Place, New York, N. Y. 1931.
- Miss ANN LOUISE PERKINS, 3322 Clinton Ave., Berwyn, Ill. 1936.
- Mr. P. D. PERKINS, Sanka Kansha, Kyoto, Japan. 1934.
- *Prof. EDWARD DELAVAN PERRY, Columbia University, New York, N. Y. 1879.
- Dr. ARNOLD PESKIND, 2409 East 55th St., Cleveland, Ohio. 1920.
- Rev. THEODORE PETERSEN, Mount Paul, Oak Ridge, N. J. 1924.
- Rev. WALTER PETERSEN, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1909.
- Prof. ROBERT HENRY PFEDTTER (Harvard Univ.), 57 Francis Ave., Cambridge, Mass. 1920.
- Prof. DRYDEN L. PHELPS, Union University, Chengtu, Szechuan Prov, W. China. 1929.
- *Rev. Dr. DAVID PHILIPSON, 270 McGregor Ave., Cincinnati, Ohio. 1889.
- Hon. WILLIAM PHILLIPS, 2929 Massachusetts Ave., Washington, D. C.
- Rev. Dr. Z. B. T. PHILLIPS, Church of the Epiphany, Washington, D. C. 1922.
- Prof. ARNO POEBEL, Oriental Institute, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1931.

- HOBACE I. POLEMAN, 402 Green Lane, Roxborough, Philadelphia, Pa. 1931.
 Prof. ROBERT T. POLLARD, Dept. of Oriental Studies, University of Washington, Seattle, Wash. 1932.
 JOHN A. POPE, 11 Francis Avenue, Cambridge, Mass. 1936.
 Prof. WILLIAM POPPER (Univ. of California), 529 The Alameda, Berkeley, Calif. 1937.
 Prof. LUCIUS C. PORTER, Yenching University, Peiping, China. 1923.
 Prof. JAMES BISSETT PRATT, Williams College, Williamstown, Mass. 1925.
 Rev. Dr. SABELL PRENTICE, 17 E. 11th St., New York, N. Y. 1921.
 *Prof. IRA M. PRICE, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1887.
 ALAN PRIEST, Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, N. Y. 1934.
 *Hon. JOHN DYNELBY PRINCE, Columbia University, New York, N. Y. 1888.
 Rev. Dr. A. H. PRUSSNER, c/o Methodist Mission, Medan, Sumatra. 1921.
 Mr. PIERRE M. PURVES, c/o E. R. Purves, Architects' Bldg., 17th and Sansom Sts., Philadelphia, Pa. 1935.
 Prof. CHARLES LYNN PYATT, The College of the Bible, Lexington, Ky. 1921 (1917).
 Prof. JACOB H. QUIRING, 509 West 121st St., New York, N. Y. 1932.
 Dr. V. V. RAMANA-SASTRI, Vedaraniyam, Tanjore District, S. India. 1921.
 Prof. JOHN H. RAVEN (New Brunswick Theol. Seminary), Bishop Place, New Brunswick, N. J. 1920.
 Prof. HARRY B. REED (Northwestern Lutheran Theol. Seminary), 960 19th Ave., N. E., Minneapolis, Minn. 1921.
 Rabbi SIDNEY L. REGENER, 2508 Grant St., Mt. Penn, Reading, Pa. 1928.
 Prof. NATHANIEL JULIUS REICH (Dropsie College), P. O. Box 337, Philadelphia, Pa. 1923.
 Dr. JOSEPH REIDER, Dropsie College, Philadelphia, Pa. 1913.
 Prof. AUGUST KARL REISCHAUER, Tokyo Joshi Daigaku, Iogimachi, Tokyo-fu, Japan. 1920.
 Prof. ROBERT KARL REISCHAUER, Ph.D., E-2 Prospect Apartments, Princeton, N. J.
 Mrs. DIANA J. REISMAN, 3425 Powelton Ave., Philadelphia, Pa. 1935.
 Dr. KARL REUNING, 47 Amherst Ave., Swarthmore, Penna. 1936.
 Rev. HILARY G. RICHARDSON, 147 North Broadway, Yonkers, N. Y. 1926.
 RUDOLF M. RIEFSTAHL, Ph.D., 48 E. 89th St., New York, N. Y. 1936.
 Dr. HOBACE ABRAM RIGG, JR., 112 Holden Green, Cambridge, Mass. 1936.
 Prof. CORWIN C. ROACH, Gambier, Ohio. 1935.
 Mr. LAURANCE P. ROBERTS, 200 Columbia Heights, Brooklyn, N. Y. 1936.
 Prof. EDWARD ROBERTSON, The University, Manchester, England.
 Prof. DAVID M. ROBINSON, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md. 1921.
 *Prof. GEORGE LIVINGSTON ROBINSON (Presbyterian Theol. Seminary), 2312 North Halsted St., Chicago, Ill. 1892.
 Rev. Dr. THEODORE H. ROBINSON, University College, Cardiff, Wales. 1922.
 Mr. GEORGE N. ROERICH, Urusvati Himalayan Research Institute, Naggur, Kulu, Punjab, India. 1922.
 Prof. NICHOLAS ROERICH, Roerich Museum, 310 Riverside Drive, New York, N. Y. 1928.

- Mr. HARVEY V. ROHRER, 324 6th St., Abilene, Kansas. 1935.
- Prof. WILLIAM ROSENAU, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md. 1897.
- LESSING J. ROSENWALD, c/o Sears, Roebuck and Co., Philadelphia, Pa. 1924.
- TRUDE W. ROSMARIN, Ph.D., 503 W. 111th St., New York, N. Y. 1933.
- Prof. MICHAEL I. ROSTOVITZ (Yale Univ.), 1916 Yale Station, New Haven, Conn. 1926.
- Mr. DAVID NELSON ROWE, 21 Conant Hall, Cambridge, Mass. 1936.
- Miss TERESINA ROWELL, 644 S. Garfield St., Hinsdale, Ill. 1931.
- Prof. GEORGE ROWLEY, McCormick Hall, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J. 1926.
- Mrs. GEORGE ROWLEY, c/o Prof. George Rowley, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J. 1931.
- Rev. Prof. H. H. ROWLEY, D.D., Dol Menai, Bangor, North Wales. 1935.
- *Miss ADELAIDE RUDOLPH, Columbia University Library, New York, N. Y. 1894.
- OTTO B. RUPP, LL.D., 660 Colman Bldg., Seattle, Wash. 1931.
- Prof. ELBERT RUSSELL, Duke University, Durham, N. C. 1916.
- Mr. JOSEPH A. RUSSELL, Room 19, Angell Hall, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich. 1935.
- PETER RUTHVEN, 815 S. University Ave., Ann Arbor, Mich. 1932.
- Mr. A. J. SACHS, 102 Aisquith St., Baltimore, Md. 1936.
- Mr. FUAD SAFAR, International House, Chicago, Ill. 1936.
- Dr. ROBERT L. SAGE, Oriental Institute, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1934.
- Dr. SHIO SAKANISHI, Division of Orientalia, Library of Congress, Washington, D. C. 1933.
- †Dr. NAJEEB M. SALEEBY, P. O. Box 130, Baguio, P. I. 1922.
- Dr. ALFRED SALMONY, Mills College, Calif. 1934.
- Prof. HENRY A. SANDERS, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich. 1924.
- Mr. HANS S. SANTESSON, "India Today and Tomorrow," 20 Vesey St., New York, N. Y. 1936.
- Prof. EDWARD SAPIR, 176 Armory St., Hamden, Conn. 1933.
- GEORGE SARTON, Sc.D., Harvard University Library, Cambridge, Mass. 1934.
- Mr. LAURISTON L. SCAIFE, General Theological Seminary, Chelsea Square, New York, N. Y.
- Rev. G. L. SCHANZLIN, Frankton, Ind. 1930 (1921).
- Dr. ISRAEL SCHAPIRO, Library of Congress, Washington, D. C. 1914.
- Prof. A. ARTHUR SCHILLER, Kent Hall, Columbia University, New York, N. Y. 1927.
- Dr. ERICH F. SCHMIDT, American Legation, Teheran, Persia. 1930.
- *Prof. NATHANIEL SCHMIDT, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y. 1894.
- HERBERT W. SCHNEIDER, Philosophy Hall, Columbia University, New York City, N. Y. 1936.
- Mr. HENRY K. SCHOCH, 10th Floor, Union Guardian Bldg., Detroit, Mich. 1934.

- Rev. Dr. SAMUEL SCHULMAN, 1 East 65th St., New York, N. Y. 1928.
 *Miss RUTH L. SCHURMAN, 5480 Ridgewood Court, Chicago, Ill. 1934.
 Mr. MAURICE D. SCHWARTZ, 5439 Kimbark Ave., Chicago, Ill. 1936.
 Prof. GILBERT CAMPBELL SCOGGIN, 11 Story St., Cambridge, Mass. 1906.
 *Mrs. SAMUEL BRYAN SCOTT (*née* Morris), 1 Norman Lane, Chestnut Hill, Philadelphia, Pa. 1903.
 Rev. KEITH C. SEELE, Chicago House, Luxor, Egypt. 1926.
 Rev. Dr. WILLIAM G. SEIPLE, 905 Cocks Lane, R. F. D. 5, Woodlawn P. O., Md. 1902.
 Prof. O. R. SELLERS (Presbyterian Theol. Seminary), 846 Chalmers Place, Chicago, Ill. 1917.
 Prof. W. T. SEMPLE (Univ. of Cincinnati), 315 Pike St., Cincinnati, Ohio. 1928.
 Rev. E. W. SERAPHIN, Holy Name College, Washington, D. C. 1935.
 Miss JEANNETTE SHAMBAUGH, 5625 University Ave., Chicago, Ill. 1935.
 Prof. SRI RAM SHARMA, Dayanand Anglo-Vedic College, Lahore, India. 1926.
 G. HOWLAND SHAW, American Embassy, Istanbul, Turkey. 1921.
 *Prof. T. LESLIE SHEAR, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J. 1923.
 Mr. EPHRAIM C. SHEDD, 6042 Dorchester Ave., Chicago, Ill. 1936.
 Prof. CHARLES N. SHEPARD (General Theol. Seminary), 9 Chelsea Square, New York, N. Y. 1907.
 Miss LOUISE ADELE SHIER, 1320 Olivia Ave., Ann Arbor, Mich. 1930.
 Dr. JOHN KNIGHT SHRYOCK (Univ. of Pennsylvania), 4509 Regent St., Philadelphia, Pa. 1922.
 Mr. TIEN TUNG SHUE, Shantung University, Tsing-tao, China. 1933.
 Rabbi ABRA HILLEL SILVER, D.D., The Temple, East 105th St. at Ansel Road, Cleveland, Ohio. 1920.
 Mr. CARROLL E. SIMCOX, Box 432, Appleton, Minn.
 MUHAMMED A. SIMSAR, D.C.S., 317 S. 41st St., Philadelphia, Pa. 1934.
 Mr. GREGG M. SINOLAR, Oriental Institute, University of Hawaii, Honolulu, Hawaii. 1936.
 Dr. SOLOMON L. SKOSS, Dropsie College, Broad and York Sts., Philadelphia, Pa. 1926.
 Prof. S. B. SLACK, 17 Barton Crescent, Dawlish, Devon, England. 1921.
 Miss WINIFRED SMEATON, 1941 Geddes Ave., Ann Arbor, Mich. 1931.
 Mr. HENRY LEE SMITH, JR., 1-A Graduate College, Princeton, N. J. 1936.
 Prof. LOUISE P. SMITH, Wellesley College, Wellesley, Mass. 1918.
 Mr. MYRON BEMENT SMITH, P. O. Box 7, Isfahan, Iran. 1930.
 Rabbi ELIAS L. SOLOMON, D.H.L., 302 West 87th St., New York, N. Y. 1921.
 E. A. SPEISER, Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa. 1925.
 Prof. ALEXANDER SPERBER, Ph.D., The Jewish Theological Seminary of America, Broadway and 122nd St., New York, N. Y. 1935.
 Rev. H. HENRY SPOER, Ph.D., City Hospital, Welfare Island, New York, N. Y. 1926 (1899).
 Prof. MARTIN SPRENGLING, Oriental Institute, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1929 (1912).

- Baron Dr. ALEXANDER VON STAEL-HOLSTEIN, Former Austrian Legation, Peiping, China. 1929.
- Mr. JOHN W. STANTON, History Department, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich. 1934.
- Dr. W. E. STAPLES, Victoria University, Toronto, Ont., Canada. 1927.
- Miss ELIZABETH STEFANSKI, Oriental Institute, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1932.
- Prof. G. NYE STEIGER, 9 Washington Ave., Cambridge, Mass. 1930.
- Rev. JOHN E. STEINMUELLER, D.D., SS.L., Seminary of the Immaculate Conception, Huntington, L. I., New York. 1936.
- Prof. FERRIS J. STEPHENS, Babylonian Collection, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. 1925.
- J. FRANK STIMSON (Bernice P. Bishop Museum), Papeete, Tahiti, French Oceania. 1928.
- Mr. WILLIAM B. STIMSON, 3914 Locust St., Philadelphia, Pa. 1928.
- Rev. Dr. ANSON PHELPS STOKES, 2408 Massachusetts Ave., N. W., Washington, D. C. 1900.
- Prof. FREDERICK AMES STUFF (Univ. of Nebraska), Station A 1263, Lincoln, Neb. 1921.
- *Prof. E. H. STURTEVANT, Yale Graduate School, York St. and Tower Parkway, New Haven, Conn. 1924.
- Dr. VISHNU S. SUKTHANKAR, Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, P. O. Deccan Gymkhana, Poona City, India. 1921.
- Prof. JOSEPH WARD SWAIN, 309 Lincoln Hall, Urbana, Ill. 1936.
- Dr. NANCY LEE SWANN, Curator, The Gest Oriental Library, Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton, N. J. 1929.
- Prof. MARY HAMILTON SWINDLER, Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, Pa. 1929.
- Prof. EARL SWISHER, University of Colorado, Boulder, Colo. 1935.
- VICTOR H. SWORD, Th.D., Gauhati, Assam, India. 1935.
- Mr. GORDON R. TAYLOR, Princess St., Kincardine, Ont., Canada. 1935.
- Prof. WILLIAM R. TAYLOR, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ont., Canada. 1925.
- Mr. ZACHARY TAYLOR, 183 Nu Road, Bangkok, Siam. 1932.
- Prof. CHAIM TCHEENOWITZ, 620 Riverside Drive, New York, N. Y. 1928.
- Rabbi SIDNEY S. TEDESCHKE, Ph.D., Union Temple, 17 Eastern Parkway, Brooklyn, N. Y. 1925 (1916).
- Rev. JOSEPH TENNANT, S.Th.D., L.R.B., Seminary of the Immaculate Conception, Huntington, L. I., New York. 1936.
- Prof. WILLIAM THOMSON (Harvard Univ.), 6 Cutler Ave., Cambridge, Mass. 1925.
- Mr. KOJIRO TOMITA, Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, Mass. 1934.
- *Prof. CHARLES C. TOBBREY, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. 1891.
- Prof. HAROLD H. TRYON, Union Theological Seminary, 3041 Broadway, New York, N. Y. 1921.
- Bishop H. ST. GEORGE TUCKER, 110 W. Franklin St., Richmond, Va. 1936.
- Miss SARAH JONES TUCKER, Bennington College, Bennington, Vt. 1934.
- Mr. PAUL A. TURNER, 355 W. Duval St., Philadelphia, Pa. 1936.

- EDWIN H. TUTTLE, The Gelhave, 405 10th St., N. E., Washington, D. C. 1925.
- *Rev. DR. LEMON LEANDER UHL, 1138 Boylston St., Boston, Mass.
- JOSEPH M. UPTON, Assistant Curator, Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, N. Y. 1931.
- Rev. SYDNEY N. USSEER, Chapel of the Good Shepherd, City Home, Welfare Island, New York, N. Y. 1909.
- Miss WILHELMINA VAN INGEN, Wheaton College, Norton, Mass. 1933.
- Rev. Dr. N. D. VAN LEEUWEN, Holysloot 43, Amsterdam-Noord, Holland. 1928.
- Prof. ARTHUR A. VASCHALDE, Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C. 1915.
- Prof. GEORGE VERNADSKY (Yale Univ.), 1984 Yale Station, New Haven, Conn. 1932.
- Prof. EDWIN E. VOIGT, c/o First Methodist Church, Iowa City, Iowa. 1925.
- Prof. HANS N. VON KOERBER, Dept. of Oriental Studies, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, Calif. 1931.
- *Mrs. SOPHIE CAMACHO WADIA, c/o The Aryan Path, 51 Esplanade Road, Bombay, India. 1927.
- Dr. ARNOLD WALTHER, Oriental Institute, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1932.
- *FELIX M. WARBURG, 52 William St., New York, N. Y. 1921.
- Dr. JAMES R. WARE, 18 Bates St., Cambridge, Mass. 1923.
- JOHN W. WARRINGTON, 217 E. Fourth St., Cincinnati, Ohio. 1936.
- Prof. LEROY WATERMAN, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich. 1912.
- Mrs. RICHARD N. WEBBER, 429 Lake Shore Road, Grosse Pointe Farms, Mich. 1935.
- *Prof. HUTTON WEBSTER, R. F. D. 2 (Box 326-A), Menlo Park, Calif. 1921.
- Miss ELSIE WEIL, c/o Asia Magazine, 40 E. 49th St., New York, N. Y. 1935.
- †Sir HENRY S. WELLCOME, Director, Wellcome Historical Medical Museum, 54A Wigmore St., London W. 1, England. 1928.
- Prof. GORDON B. WELLMAN (Wellesley College), 17 Midland Road, Wellesley, Mass. 1928.
- ARCHIBALD GIBSON WENLEY, Freer Gallery of Art, Washington, D. C. 1925.
- The Rt. Rev. WILLIAM C. WHITE, Royal Ontario Museum, Toronto, Ontario, Canada. 1935.
- *Miss MARGARET DWIGHT WHITNEY, 186 Edwards St., New Haven, Conn. 1908.
- PERCIVAL W. WHITTLESEY, M.A., Highmount Ave., Nyack, N. Y. 1920.
- *Miss CAROLYN M. WICKER, c/o Rierson Library Art Institute, Chicago, Ill. 1921.
- DEAN R. WICKES, 109 Varnum St., N. W., Washington, D. C. 1936.
- Prof. ALBAN G. WIDGERY, Box 4738, Duke University, Durham, N. C. 1929.
- MOSE WILBUSHEWICH, Scientific Research Laboratory, Haifa, Palestine. 1928.

- Miss RUTH C. WILKINS, 4436 Berkeley Ave., Chicago, Ill. 1931.
Prof. HERBERT L. WILLETT (Univ. of Chicago), 319 Richmond Road,
Kenilworth, Ill. 1917.
*Hon. EDWARD T. WILLIAMS, 1412 Scenic Ave., Berkeley, Calif. 1901.
Mrs. FREDERICK WELLS WILLIAMS, 155 Whitney Ave., New Haven, Conn.
1918.
Rev. WALTER G. WILLIAMS, Ph.D., 9108 Union Ave., Cleveland, Ohio. 1932.
Prof. JOHN A. WILSON, Oriental Institute, University of Chicago, Chicago,
Ill. 1924.
HERBERT E. WINLOCK, Director, Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York,
N. Y. 1919.
FREDERICK V. WINNETT, Ph.D., 242 Greer Road, Toronto, Ont., Canada.
1935.
*Rev. Dr. STEPHEN S. WISE, 40 West 68th St., New York, N. Y. 1894.
Rev. R. EMERSON WOLFE, Boxford, Mass. 1932.
Mr. STUART N. WOLFENDEN, c/o National Provincial Bank, Charing Branch,
66 Charing Cross, London S. W. 1, England. 1935.
Prof. HARRY A. WOLFSON, 15 Widener Library, Cambridge, Mass. 1917.
†Prof. JAMES H. WOODS (Harvard Univ.), 29 Follen St., Cambridge, Mass.
1900.
Prof. W. H. WORRELL, Angell Hall, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor,
Mich. 1928 (1910).
Mr. G. ERNEST WRIGHT, 3309 Guilford Ave., Baltimore, Md. 1934.
Pres. WALTER L. WRIGHT, JR., Robert Kolec, Galata P. K. 1932. Istanbul,
Turkey. 1931.
Prof. HERBICK B. YOUNG, c/o Board of Foreign Missions, 156 Fifth Ave.,
New York, N. Y. 1928.
Mr. T. CUYLER YOUNG, c/o Oriental Institute, University of Chicago,
Chicago, Ill. 1936.
Rev. Prof. SAMUEL M. ZWEMER (Princeton Theol. Seminary), 48 Mercer
St., Princeton, N. J. 1920.

[Total: 593]

Corrected to December 23, 1936.

PUBLISHED BY THE AMERICAN ORIENTAL SOCIETY

ADDRESS, CARE OF

YALE UNIVERSITY PRESS

NEW HAVEN, CONNECTICUT, U. S. A.

1936